THIS BOOK
MUST NOT BE REMOVED
FROM THE LIBRARY

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON LIBRARY

REFERENCE ONLY

PARL. PAPERS
FOR REFERENCE ONLY.

University of London

616976

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/parliamentary-debates_may-17-june-13-1904_135

THE

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(AUTHORISED EDITION),

FOURTH SERIES.

FIFTH SESSION OF THE TWENTY-SEVENTH PARLIAMENT

OF THE

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

4 EDWARD VII.

VOLUME CXXXV.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE SEVENTEENTH DAY OF MAY
TO THE THIRTEENTH DAY OF JUNE, 1904.

SEVENTH VOLUME OF SESSION

1904.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED
UNDER CONTRACT WITH HIS MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE,
BY
WYMAN AND SONS, LIMITED, FETTER LANE, LONDON.

8472

CHRONOLOGY OF "THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES."

THE PARLIAMENTARY HISTORY contains all that can be collected of the Legislative History of this country from the Conquest to the close of the XVIIIth Century (1803), 36 vols. The chief sources whence these Debates are derived are the Constitutional History, 24 vols. ; Sir Simonds D'Ewes' Journal ; Debates of the Commons in 1620 and 1621 ; Chandler and Timberland's Debates, 22 vols. ; Grey's Debates of the Commons, from 1667 to 1694, 10 vols. : Almon's Debates, 24 vols. ; Debrett's Debates, 63 vols. ; The Hardwicke Papers ; Debates in Parliament by Dr. Johnson, &c., &c.

THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES commence with the year 1803, and the contents are set forth in the following Chronological Table :—

HISTORY.

CONQUEST to 34 GEO. II.—1066 to 1760.

Vol. 1 to 15, 1 WILL. I. to 34 GEO. II.
1066-1760

REIGN OF GEORGE III.—1760 to 1820.

Vol. 15 to 35, 1 GEO. III. to 40 GEO. III.
1760-1800

(FIRST PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 35	41 GEO. III.	1801
— 36	42 —	1802

(SECOND PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 36	42 GEO. III.	1802-3

DEBATES.

First Series.

(SECOND PARLIAMENT—*continued.*)

Vol. 1 & 2	44 GEO. III.	1803-4
— 3 to 5	45 —	1805
— 6 & 7	46 —	1806

(THIRD PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 8 & 9	47 GEO. III.	1806-7

(FOURTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 9 to 11	48 GEO. III.	1807-8
— 12 — 14	49 —	1809
— 15 — 17	50 —	1810
— 18 — 20	51 —	1810-11
— 21 — 23	52 —	1812

(FIFTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 24 to 26	53 GEO. III.	1812-13
— 27 & 28	54 —	1813-14
— 29 to 31	55 —	1814-15
— 32 — 34	56 —	1816
— 35 & 36	57 —	1817
— 37 — 38	58 —	1818

(SIXTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 39 & 40	59 GEO. III.	1819
— 41	60 —	1819-20

Second Series.

REIGN OF GEORGE IV.—1820 to 1830.

(SEVENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 1 to 3	1 GEO. IV.	1820
— 4 & 5	2 —	1821
— 6 — 7	3 —	1822
— 8 — 9	4 —	1823
— 10 — 11	5 —	1824
— 12 — 13	6 —	1825-6
— 14 — 15	7 —	1826

(EIGHTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 16	7 GEO. IV.	1826
— 17	8 —	1827
— 18 & 19	9 —	1828
— 20 — 21	10 —	1829
— 22 to 25	11 —	1830

Third Series.

REIGN OF WILLIAM IV.—1830 to 1837.

(NINTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 1 to 3	1 WILL. IV.	1830-1

(TENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 4 to 8	2 WILL. IV.	1831
— 9 — 14	3 —	1832

(ELEVENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 15 to 20	4 WILL. IV.	1833
— 21 — 25	5 —	1834

(TWELFTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 26 to 30	6 WILL. IV.	1835
— 31 — 35	7 —	1836
— 36 — 38	8 —	1837

REIGN OF VICTORIA—1837 to 1901.

(Thirteenth Parliament.)

Vol.	39 to 44	1	Victoria	1838
—	45 — 50	2	—	1839
—	51 — 55	3	—	1840
—	56 — 58	4	—	(a) 1841

(Fourteenth Parliament.)

Vol.	59	4	Victoria	(b) 1841
—	60 to 65	5	—	1842
—	66 — 71	6	—	1843
—	72 — 76	7	—	1844
—	77 — 82	8	—	1845
—	83 — 88	9	—	1846
—	89 — 94	10	—	(a) 1847

(Fifteenth Parliament.)

Vol.	95	10	Victoria	(b) 1847
—	96 to 101	11	—	1848
—	102 —107	12	—	1849
—	108 —113	13	—	1850
—	114 —118	14	—	1851
—	119 —122	15	—	(a) 1852

(Sixteenth Parliament.)

Vol.	123	15	Victoria	(b) 1852
—	124 to 129	16	—	1853
—	130 —135	17	—	1854
—	136 —139	18	—	1855
—	140 —143	19	—	1856
—	144	20	—	(a) 1857

(Seventeenth Parliament.)

Vol.	145 to 147	20	Victoria	(b) 1857
—	148 —151	21	—	1858
—	152 —153	22	—	(a) 1859

(Eighteenth Parliament.)

Vol.	154 to 155	22	Victoria	(b) 1859
—	156 —160	23	—	1860
—	161 —164	24	—	1861
—	165 —168	25	—	1862
—	169 —172	26	—	1863
—	173 —176	27	—	1864
—	177 —180	28	—	1865

(Nineteenth Parliament.)

Vol.	181 to 184	29	Victoria	1866
—	185 —189	30	—	1867
—	190 —193	31	—	1867-8

(Twentieth Parliament.)

Vol.	194 to 198	32	Victoria	1868-9
—	199 —203	33	—	1870
—	204 —208	34	—	1871
—	209 —213	35	—	1872
—	214 —217	36	—	1873

(Twenty-First Parliament.)

Vol.	218 to 221	37	Victoria	1874
—	222 —226	38	—	1875
—	227 —231	39	—	1876
—	232 —236	40	—	1877
—	237 —242	41	—	1878
—	243 —249	42	—	1878-9
—	250 & 251	43	—	(a) 1880

(Twenty-Second Parliament.)

Vol.	252 to 256	43	Victoria	(b) 1880
—	257 —265	44	—	1881
—	266 —273	45	—	(a) 1882
—	274 & 275	45	—	(b) 1882
—	276 to 283	46	—	1883
—	284 —292	47	—	1884
—	293 —301	48	—	1884-5

(Twenty-Third Parliament.)

Vol.	302 to 307	49	Victoria	(a) 1886

(Twenty-Fourth Parliament.)

Vol.	308 & 309	49	Victoria	(b) 1886
—	310 to 321	50	—	1887
—	322 —332	51	—	1888
—	333 —340	52	—	1889
—	341 —348	53	—	1890
—	349 —356	54	—	1890-1

Fourth Series.

(Twenty-Fourth Parliament—*cont.*)

Vol.	1 to 6	55	Victoria	1892

(Twenty-Fifth Parliament.)

Vol.	7	56	Victoria	1892
—	8 to 21	57	—	1893-4
—	22 — 29	57	—	1894
—	30 — 35	58	—	1895

(Twenty-Sixth Parliament.)

Vol.	36	59	Victoria	1895
—	37 to 44	59	—	1895-6
—	45 — 52	60	—	1897
—	53 — 65	61	—	1898
—	66 — 76	62	—	1899
—	77	63	—	1899
—	78 — 83	63	—	1900
—	84	63 & 64	—	1900
—	85 — 87	64	—	1900

(Twenty-Seventh Parliament.)

Vol.	88	64	Victoria	1900

REIGN OF EDWARD VII.

(Twenty-Seventh Parliament—*cont.*)

Vol.	89	1	Edward VII	1901
—	90 to 100	1	—	1901
—	101	1 & 2	—	1902
—	102 to 117	2	—	1902
—	118 to 128	3	—	1903
—	129 to 135	4	—	1904

HIS MAJESTY'S PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF STATE, Etc.

THE CABINET.

Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury——Rt. Hon. Arthur J. Balfour.
Lord President of the Council and President of the Board of Education——Most Hon. the Marquess of Londonderry, K.G.
Lord Chancellor——Rt. Hon. Earl of Halsbury.
Secretaries of State——
  Foreign Affairs——Most Hon. the Marquess of Lansdowne, K.G.
  Home Department——Rt. Hon. A. Akers-Douglas, M.P.
  Colonial——Rt. Hon. Alfred Lyttelton, M.P.
  War——Rt. Hon. H. O. Arnold-Forster, M.P.
  India——Rt. Hon. W. St. John Brodrick, M.P.
Chancellor of the Exchequer——Rt. Hon. J. Austen Chamberlain, M.P.
First Lord of the Admiralty——Rt. Hon. Earl of Selborne.
Lord Chancellor of Ireland——Rt. Hon. Lord Ashbourne.
President of the Board of Trade——Rt. Hon. Gerald W. Balfour, M.P
Postmaster-General——Rt Hon. Lord Stanley, M.P.
Secretary for Scotland——Rt. Hon. A. Graham Murray, M.P.
President of the Local Government Board——Rt. Hon. Walter H. Long, M P
President of the Board of Agriculture——Rt. Hon. Earl of Onslow.
Chief Secretary for Ireland——Rt. Hon. George Wyndham, M.P.
Lord Privy Seal——Most Hon. the Marquess of Salisbury.

NOT IN THE CABINET.

Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasury——Sir A. Acland-Hood, Bt., M.P.
Financial Secretary to the Treasury——Victor Cavendish, Esq., M.P.
Secretary of the Board of Education——Sir William Anson, M.P.
Secretary to the Admiralty——E. G. Pretyman, Esq., M.P.
Lords of the Treasury——
  Lord Balcarres, M.P.
  Hon. Ailwyn Fellowes, M.P.
  H. W. Forster, Esq., M.P.
Lords of the Admiralty——
  Admiral Lord W. T. Kerr, K.C.B.
  Rear-Admiral Sir C. C. Drury, K.C.S.I.
  Rear-Admiral W. H. May, M.V.O.
  Rear-Admiral John Durnford, C.B., D.S.O.
Army Council——
  The Secretary of State for War [*in the Cabinet*].
  Lt.-Gen. Sir N. G. Lyttelton, K.C.B.
  Major-General C. W. H. Douglas.
  Major-General H. C. O. Plumer, C.B.
  Major-General Sir J. W. Murray, K.C.B.
  The Under-Secretary of State for War.
  The Financial Secretary to the War Office.
  Secretary. The Permanent Under-Secretary of State for War (Col. Sir E. W. D. Ward, K.C.B.).
Civil Lord of the Admiralty——Arthur H. Lee, Esq., M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary, Foreign Office——Earl Percy, M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary, Home Office——Hon. T. H. Cochrane, M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary, Colonial Office——His Grace the Duke of Marlborough.
Parliamentary Secretary, India Office——Rt. Hon. Earl of Hardwicke.
Parliamentary Secretary, War Office——Rt. Hon. Earl of Donoughmore.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade——A. Bonar Law, Esq., M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Local Government Board——J. Grant Lawson, Esq., M.P.
Financial Secretary, War Office——W. Bromley Davenport, Esq., M.P.
Attorney-General——Sir R. B. Finlay, K.C., M.P.
Solicitor-General——Rt. Hon. Sir E. Carson, K.C., M.P.
Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland——Rt. Hon. Earl of Dudley.
The Lord Advocate——C. Scott Dickson, Esq., K.C., M.P.
Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster——Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. Walrond, Bt., M.P.

OTHER OFFICERS OF STATE.

Judge Advocate-General——Rt. Hon. Sir F. H. Jeune, K.C.B., President Probate, Divorce, and Admiralty Division.
Lord Chamberlain——Rt. Hon. Earl of Clarendon.
Vice-Chamberlain——Rt. Hon. Lord Wolverton.
Lord Steward——Rt. Hon. Earl of Pembroke and Montgomery, G.C.V.O.
Master of the Horse——His Grace the Duke of Portland, K.G., G.C.V.O.
Paymaster-General——Sir Savile Crossley, Bt., M.V.O., M.P.
Comptroller of the Household——Viscount Valentia, M.P.
Treasurer of the Household——The Marquess of Hamilton, M.P.
Captain Yeomen of the Guard—Rt. Hon. Earl Waldegrave.

Lords-in-Waiting——
- Rt. Hon. Earl of Kintore, G.C.M.G.
- Rt. Hon. Earl of Denbigh.
- Rt. Hon. Lord Churchill, K.C.V.O.
- Rt. Hon. Earl Howe.
- Rt. Hon. Lord Lawrence.
- Rt. Hon. Lord Bagot.
- Rt. Hon. Lord Suffield, G.C.V.O., K.C.B.
- Rt. Hon. Lord Kenyon.

SCOTLAND.

Secretary for Scotland and Keeper of the Great Seal——Rt. Hon. A. Graham Murray.
Lord Justice-General——Rt. Hon. Lord Kinross.
Lord Advocate——Rt. Hon. C. Scott Dickson, Esq., K.C., M.P.
Lord Justice Clerk——Rt. Hon. Lord Kinsburgh, C.B.
Lord Clerk Register——His Grace the Duke of Montrose, K.T.
Lord High Commissioner——Rt. Hon. Earl of Leven and Melville.
Solicitor-General——David Dundas, Esq., K.C.

IRELAND.

Lord Lieutenant——Rt. Hon. Earl of Dudley.
Lord Chancellor——Rt. Hon. Lord Ashbourne.
Chief Secretary and Keeper of Privy Seal——Rt. Hon. George Wyndham, M.P.
Under Secretary——Sir Antony McDonnell, G.C.S.I.
Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction——President: The Rt. Hon. the Chief Secretary for Ireland; Vice-President: Rt. Hon. Horace Plunkett.
Attorney-General——Rt. Hon. J. Atkinson, K.C., M.P.
Solicitor-General——J. H. M. Campbell, Esq., K.C., M.P.

PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF LORDS.

Chairman of Committees——Rt. Hon. Earl of Morley.
Clerk of Parliaments——Sir Henry J. L. Graham, K.C.B.
Deputy Clerk of Parliaments (Clerk Assistant)——Hon. E. P. Thesiger, C.B.
Reading-Clerk and Clerk of Outdoor Committees——Edward Hall Alderson, Esq.
Counsel to the Chairman of Committees——Albert Gray, Esq.
Chief Clerk and Clerk of Public Bills——A. Harrison, Esq.
Senior Clerks——
- Peers' Printed Paper Office——C. L. Anstruther, Esq.
- Principal Clerk, Judicial Department, and Taxing Officer of Judicial Costs——J. F. Skene, Esq.
- Clerk of the Journals——W. A. Leigh, Esq.
- Principal Clerk of Private Committees——J. F. Symons Jeune, Esq.

Other Clerks——W. H. Hamilton Gordon, Esq.; Hon. A. McDonnell; A. H. Robinson, Esq. (Clerk of Private Bills); H. P. St. John, Esq.; V. M. Biddulph, Esq.; Hon. E. A. Stonor; H. J. F. Badeley, Esq.; C. Headlam, Esq.; J. B. Hotham, Esq.; E. C. Vigors, Esq.; A. Tennyson, Esq.; and G. D. Luard, Esq.
Accountant and Copyist——Mr. T. A. Court.
Assistant Copyists——Mr. H. P. Norris and Mr. R. A. Court.
Messengers——Messrs. A. A. Worfell, C. E. Chizlett, A. M. Stoll, J. W. F. Locke, J. McMillan, G. Bennett, G. T. Philip.
Librarian——Edmund Gosse, Esq.
Assistant Librarian——A. H. M. Butler, Esq.
Attendant——Mr. W. Worfell.

Examiners for Standing Orders——C. W. Campion, Esq.; J. F. Symons Jeune, Esq.; Clerk——B. H. Fell, Esq.
Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod——Gen. Sir Michael A. S. Biddulph, G.C.B.
Yeoman Usher——Captain T. D. Butler.
Serjeant-at-Arms——Lt.-Col. Rt. Hon. Sir Fleetwood I. Edwards, G.C.V.O., K.C.B.
Deputy Serjeant-at-Arms——S. Hand, Esq.
Resident Superintendent——J K. Williams, Esq.
Shorthand Writer——W. H. Gurney Salter, Esq.
Principal Doorkeepers——Messrs. W. Chandler, E. Fox, F. Holman.
First Class Assistants——Messrs. C. Walker, J. Hedley, J. Lane, B. Gallop.
Second Class Assistants——Messrs. H. B. Strevens, G. W. Cross, W. Stopp.
Third Class Assistants——Messrs. J. Woolacott, A. A. Edney, J. F. Baum.
Messengers——Messrs. A. J. Solman, J. B. Forsyth, C. Chapman, W. Phillips, W. W. Meates.
Superintendent of Refreshment Rooms——Mr. W. Casbon.
Inspector of Police attending the House of Lords——Mr. A. Palmer.
Clerk of the Works, Houses of Parliament——Mr. C. J. Williams.
Resident Engineer, Houses of Parliament——Mr. A. P. Patey.

PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Clerk of the House of Commons——Sir Courtney Peregrine Ilbert, K.C.S.I., C.I.E.
Clerk-Assistant——Arthur W. Nicholson, Esq.
Second Clerk-Assistant——T. L. Webster, Esq.
Principal Clerks——
  Public Bill Office, and Clerk of Fees——W. Gibbons, Esq., C.B.
  Clerk of the Journals——W. H. Ley, Esq.
  Committee Office——R. Dickinson, Esq.
  Private Bill Office——J. H. W. Somerset, Esq.
Senior Clerks——F. St. George Tupper, Esq.; H. C. Tower Esq.; C. V. Frere, Esq.; L. T. Le Marchant, Esq.; G. C. Giffard, Esq.; Sir E. H. Doyle, Bart.
Assistant Clerks——S. L. Simeon, Esq.; Arthur I. Dasent, Esq.; E. C. Howe Browne, Esq.; Horace West, Esq.; Henry A. Ferguson-Davie, Esq.; Arthur H. Ellis, Esq. Percy A. Bull, Esq.; F. R. Williams Wynn, Esq.; W. E. Grey, Esq.; F C Holland, Esq.; J. W. G. Bond, Esq.
Junior Clerks——H. C. Dawkins, Esq.; R. P. Colomb, Esq.; B. H. Fell, Esq.; R. E Childers, Esq.; J. Scott Porter, Esq.; F. C. Bramwell, Esq.; W. T. Legge, Esq. C. R. Turner, Esq.; W. K. Gibbons, Esq.; A. E. A. W. Smyth, Esq.; K. J. C Moorsom, Esq.; R. D. Radcliffe, Esq.
Serjeant-at-Arms——H. D. Erskine, Esq., C.V.O.
Deputy Serjeant——F. R. Gosset, Esq.
Assistant Sergeant——W. H. Erskine, Esq.
Office Messenger——Mr. C. J. H. Shearn.
Chaplain to the House——The Ven. Archdeacon Basil Wilberforce, D.D.
Secretary to the Speaker——Edward Gully, Esq., C.B.
Counsel to the Speaker——Hon. Sir E. Chandos Leigh, K.C., K.C.B.
Trainbearer——Mr. J. French.
Messenger——Mr. W. Murrell.
Collectors of Fees on Private Bills——C. L. Lockton, Esq.
Clerk to Referees——Sir E. H. Doyle, Bart.
Examiners of Private Bills——C. W. Campion, Esq.; J. F. Symons Jeune, Esq.
Taxing Master——C. W. Campion, Esq.; Clerk——B. H. Fell, Esq.
Vote Office——
  Principal Clerk——Philip Smith, Esq.
  Assistant Clerks——H. Otway Mayne, Esq.; John Poyser, Esq.
  Messenger——Mr. John Edwards.
Librarian——R. C. Walpole, Esq.; Assistant Librarian——Temple Franks, Esq., B.C.L.; Clerks in Library——Messrs. J. R. Crimp, Wm. Stewart; Messengers——Messrs. A. Firmin, W. Hague.
Shorthand Writer——W. H. Gurney Salter, Esq.
Printers——
  Journals——G. E. Briscoe Eyre, Esq.
  Votes——J. B. Nichols, Esq.
Postmaster——Mr. I. Lincoln; Hall Keeper——Mr. J. Glynn.
Office Keeper——Mr. H. Bullock.
Office Clerk in Committee Office——Mr. T. Fielden Mitchell.
Office Clerk in Journal Office——Mr. A. A. Taylor.
Messengers——Messrs. C. Davie, W. Quantrill, H. Jones, G. D. Weller, J. Armstrong, J. Woodward, J. Ivory, G Norman, J. Surrey, A. Sepple.
Doorkeepers——Mr. W. Wilson and Mr. M. Inglefield.

Messengers (1st Class)——Mr. H. HAMBLING, Mr. C. WOODCRAFT, Mr. R. ROBERTSON, Mr. J. HILLS, Mr. J. SPRAGUE, Mr. A. ANDREWS, Mr. T. B. SPRAY, Mr. G. TYE, Mr. R. HOBBY, Mr. G. ANSTEY, Mr. J. H. DAY.

Messengers (2nd Class)——Messrs. J. HENDERSON, G. WAINWRIGHT, J. GUYATT, R. TURTLE, A. HASKELL, A. C. JOHNSON, G. CLAPPERTON, H. E. LININGTON, H. G. EMMETT.

Superintendent of Members' Waiting Room——Mr. J. F. HENLEY; Assistant——Mr. W. BROADBENT; Porters——Messrs. J. ORAM and J. HART.

Chief Inspector of Police attending the House of Commons——Mr. SCANTLEBURY.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TO

VOLUME CXXXV.

SEVENTH VOLUME OF SESSION, 1904.

HOUSE OF LORDS: TUESDAY, 17TH MAY, 1904.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Page

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with:—Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) [H.L.]; Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 1) [H.L.].

And also the Certificate that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with:—Plymouth Corporation.

The same were ordered to lie on the Table 1

Gomersal Gas Bill.—London, Tilbury, and Southend Railway Bill; Bexhill Water and Gas Bill; Littlestone-on-Sea and District Water Bill; Colney Hatch Gas Bill. Reported with Amendments 1

Sheppy Gas Bill.—Richard Jaeger's Patent Bill [H.L.] Reported, without Amendment 1

Great Central Railway Bill.—Doncaster Corporation Bill. Read 2^{a}, and committed. The Committees to be proposed by the Committee of Selection 2

Holywood Tramways Bill [H.L.].—North Wales Electric Power Bill [H.L.]; Bristol Corporation Bill [H.L.] Read 3^{a}, and passed, and sent to the Commons 2

Chippenham Gas Bill.—Read 3^{a}, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons 2

Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway (Various Powers) Bill.—Brought from the Commons; read 1^{a}; and referred to the Examiners 2

Gosport Water Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments 2

North Staffordshire Railway Bill.—The King's consent signified; and Bill reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments 2

May 17.] *Page*

Bristol Tramways (Extensions) Bill [H.L.].—Midland Railway Bill; Baker Street and Waterloo Railway Bill; Wolverhampton Corporation Bill; Harrow Road and Paddington Tramways Bill; Oakengates, Dawley, and District Joint Water Board Bill [H.L.]; Humber Commercial Railway and Dock Bill. Report from the Committee of Selection, That the following Lords be proposed to the House to form the Select Committee for the consideration of the said Bills; viz., M. Winchester, M. Exeter, E. Dartmouth, E. Belmore (chairman), L. Digby; agreed to, and the said Lords appointed accordingly. The Committee to meet on Thursday the 9th of June next at Eleven o'clock; and all petitions referred to the Committee, with leave to the petitioners praying to be heard by counsel against the Bill to be heard as desired, as also counsel for the Bills 2

Manchester Corporation (General Powers) Bill [H.L.].—Manchester Corporation Tramways Bill [H.L.]; Torquay Tramways Bill; Charing Cross, Euston, and Hampstead Railway Bill; Soothill Nether Urban District Tramways Bill; London and North Western Railway Bill. Report from the Committee of Selection, That the following Lords be proposed to the House to form the Select Committee for the consideration of the said Bills; viz., E. Strange (*D. Atholl*), E. Westmeath, L. Mendip (*V. Clifden*), L. Deramore, L. Hawkesbury (chairman); agreed to, and the said Lords appointed accordingly. The Committee to meet on Thursday the 9th of June next at Eleven a'clock; and all petitions referred to the Committee, with leave to the petitioners praying to be heard by counsel against the Bill to be heard as desired, as also counsel for the Bills 3

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (Birmingham) Bill [H.L.].—Committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Thursday next 3

Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 1) Bill [H.L.].—Amendment reported (according to order), and Bill to be read 3ª on Thursday next .. 3

Canal Rates and Charges (Regents Canal) Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]—Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill [H.L.] Read 2ª (according to order) 3

PETITIONS.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES (METRIC SYSTEM) BILL [H.L.].—Petitions in favour of; of town, city, and county councils of; Barrow in Furness; Canterbury; Chelmsford; Chester; Deptford; Huddersfield; Islington; Lewisham; Macclesfield; Radnorshire; Salford; Workington; Worthing; Wandsworth; Worcestershire Chamber of Agriculture; Institution of Engineers and Shipbuilders in Scotland; Liverpool and District Society of Incorporated Accountants. Read, and ordered to lie on the Table 4

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

STATIONERY OFFICE.—Fourth Report of the Controller of His Majesty's Stationery Office 4

ACCIDENTS.—General Report to the Board of Trade upon the accidents that have occurred on the railways of the United Kingdom during the year 1903 4

May 17.]

Page

MINES AND QUARRIES (GENERAL REPORT AND STATISTICS FOR 1902: PART IV. COLONIAL AND FOREIGN STATISTICS.—Statistics relating to persons employed, output, and accidents at mines and quarries in the British Colonies and in Foreign Countries, edited by Sir Clement le Neve Foster, D.Sc., F.R.S.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 4

UNION OF BENEFICES (METROPOLIS) ACT, 1860.—Scheme of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners for effecting the union of the benefice of St. John, Fitzroy Square, in the Metropolis, and the benefice of St. Saviour, Fitzoy Square, and for effecting certain other measures incidental to or arising out of such union. Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and to be printed. (No. 80) 4

ARKLOW HARBOUR.—Report of the Arklow Harbour Commissioners, and Statement of Accounts for 1903. Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 4

Prevention of Corruption Bill [H.L.].—Bills of Exchange Act, 1882, Amendment Bill [H.L.]; Prize Courts Bills [H.L.]. Reported from the Standing Committee without Amendment, and to be read 3ª on Thursday next .. 5

Street Betting Bill [H.L.].—Reported from the Standing Committee with a further Amendment. The Report of the Amendments made in Committee of the Whole House, and by the Standing Committee, to be received on Thursday next 5

NEW BILLS.

Married Women's Property Act (1882) Amendment Bill [H.L.].—A Bill to amend the Married Women's Property Act, 1882, was presented by the Lord Chancellor; read 1ª; and to be printed. (No. 82) 5

Seamen's and Soldiers' False Characters Bill [H.L.].—A Bill to amend the law relating to the falsification of seamen's and soldiers' certificates of service or discharge, and to false statements made, used, or given in connection with entry or enlistment into His Majesty's Naval, Military, or Marine Forces—as presented by the Viscount Hutchinson (*E. Donoughmore*) read 1ª; to be printed; and to be read 2ª on Tuesday, the 7th of June next. (No. 81) 5

MONUMENT TO LORD SALISBURY.

The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (*The Marquess of Lansdowne*) 5

Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty praying that His Majesty will give directions that a monument be erected in the Collegiate Church of St. Peter's, Westminster, to the memory of the late Right Hon. the Marquess of Salisbury, with an inscription expressive of the high sense entertained by the House of his rare and splendid gifts, and of his devoted labours in Parliament and in great offices of State."—(*The Marquess of Lansdowne.*)

Earl Spencer 8

On Question, Motion agreed to.

Ordered that the said Address be presented to His Majesty by the Lords with White Staves.

May 17.] Page

Weights and Measures (Metric System) Bill [H.L.]—[THIRD READING].—Order of the day for the Third Reading read.

Lord Belhaven and Stenton 11

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3^{a}."—(*Lord Belhaven and Stenton.*)

On Question, Bill read 3^{a}; an Amendment (Privilege) made; Bill passed, and sent to the Commons.

COTTON AS CONTRABAND OF WAR.

Lord Avebury 11
The Marquess of Lansdowne 12

TIBET.

Earl Spencer 12
The Under-Secretary of State for India (*The Earl of Hardwicke*) 15
Lord Tweedmouth 18
The Marquess of Lansdowne 20

House adjourned at a quarter before Six o'clock, to Thursday next, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: TUESDAY, 17TH MAY, 1904.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH).—Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That in the case of the following Bills, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz.:—Cardiff Railway Bill [Lords]; Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire Electric Power Bill [Lords]; Great Yarmouth Corporation Bill [Lords]; Leicestershire and Warwickshire Electric Power Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time 23

Ryde Gas Bill.—Lords Amendment considered, and agreed to 23

Brymbo Water Bill.—Read the third time, and passed 23

Cambrian Railways Bill [LORDS].—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 23

London and India Docks Company Bill.—Read the third time, and passed .. 23

Elysee Palace Hotel Company Bill [LORDS].—As amended, considered; to be read the third time 23

May 17.]

Page

Clyde Valley Electrical Power Bill [Lords].—St. Bartholomew's Hospital Bill [Lords]. Read a second time, and committed 23

Land Drainage Provisional Order (Owston and West Butterwick, in County of Lincoln (Parts of Lindsey) Bill.—Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill. Read a second time, and committed 23

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill.—Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 12) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 13) Bill. Read a second time, and committed 24

Education Board Provisional Orders (Cardiff and Newport (Monmouthshire) Bill (by Order).—Second Reading deferred till To-morrow .. 24

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 8)—Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade, under the Electric Lighting Acts, 1882 and 1888, relating to Caerphilly, Epsom Rural District (Cheam), Mansfield Woodhouse, North Worcestershire (Bromsgrove Urban), Stroud, Nailsworth and Durley, and Sutton-in-Ashfield, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Bonar Law and Mr. Gerald Balfour .. ..

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill.—"To confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Electric Lighting Acts, 1882 and 1888, relating to Caerphilly, Epsom Rural District (Cheam), Mansfield Woodhouse, North Worcestershire (Bromsgrove Urban), Stroud, Nailsworth and Durley, and Sutton-in-Ashfield," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 198.] 24

Education Board Provisional Order (Swansea) Bill.—To confirm a Provisional Order made by the Board of Education, under Sections 17 (7) and 21 of The Education Act, 1902, relating to the County Borough of Swansea, ordered to be brought in by Sir William Anson and Mr. Victor Cavendish.

Educational Board Provisional Order (Swansea) Bill.—"To confirm a Provisional Order made by the Board of Education, under Sections 17 (7) and 21 of The Education Act, 1902, relating to the County Borough of Swansea," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 199.] .. 24

London County Council (Tramways and Improvements) Bill; Barnard Castle Gas Bill [Lords]. Reported, with Amendments; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 25

Govan Burgh (Electricity) Bill [Lords]. Reported, without Amendment; Report to lie upon the Table.
Bill to be read the third time. 25

Skipton Water and Improvement Bill.—Reported, with Amendments, from the Police and Sanitary Committee [Section A]; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 25

May 17.] *Page*

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to—Croydon Gas Bill, with Amendments.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confirm a Provisional Order made by the Board of Education under the Education Acts, 1870 to 1903, to enable the School Board for London to put in force the Land Clauses Acts." [Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London) Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, " An Act to empower the Portmadoc, Beddgelert, and South Snowdon Railway Company to construct new railways and to authorise agreements between that Company and the North Wales Narrow Gauge Railways Company ; and for other purposes." [Portmadoc, Beddgelert, and South Snowdon Railway] Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, " An Act to confer further powers on the Corporation of Preston with reference to their water undertaking ; and for other purposes." [Preston Corporation Water Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, " An Act to empower the Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of the borough of Bournemouth to construct further tramways and to acquire the undertaking of the Tucton Bridge Company ; and for other purposes." [Bournemouth Corporation (Tramways) Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, " An Act to enable the mayor, aldermen, and citizens of the city and county of Newcastle-upon-Tyne to construct and work additional tramways in and adjacent to the city ; to widen existing streets ; to construct new streets across and works in the Ouseburn Valley ; to make a new quay ; to acquire lands ; to establish a superannuation fund ; to raise further money ; and to confer various further powers upon the corporation in respect of their existing quays ; and for other purposes." [Newcastle-upon-Tyne Corporation Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill intituled, " An Act to empower the Alexandra (Newport) and South Wales) Docks and Railway Companies to extend their existing South Dock and to construct other works and to execute a diversion or straightening of the River Ebbw ; for changing the name of the company ; and for other purposes." [Alexandra (Newport and South Wales) Docks and Railway Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to provide for the payment to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners and application by them of moneys payable under The City and South London Railway Act, 1896, by the City and South London Railway Company in respect of the church of St. Mary Woolnoth, in the City of London ; and for other purposes. [St. Mary Woolnoth Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, " An Act to authorise the making of tramways and tramroads in the city of Belfast and in the county of Down ; and for other purposes." [Holywood Tramways Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, " An Act for empowering the North Wales Power and Traction Company, Limited, to construct generating stations and supply electricity in certain parts of North Wales ; and for other purposes." [North Wales Electric Power Bill [Lords.]

And, also, a Bill, intituled, " An Act to extend the city and county of Bristol ; and for other purposes." [Bristol Corporation Bill [Lords.] 25

May 17.] *Page*

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London) Bill [Lords]. Read the first time; referred to the examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 200.] 26

Portmadoc, Beddgelert, and South Snowdon Railway Bill [Lords]: Preston Corporation Water Bill [Lords]. Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills 26

Bournemouth Corporation (Tramways) Bill [Lords]; Newcastle-upon-Tyne Corporation Bill [Lords]; Alexandra (Newport and South Wales) Docks and Railway Bill [Lords]; St. Mary Woolnoth Bill [Lords]; Holywood Tramways Bill [Lords]; North Wales Electric Power Bill [Lords]; Bristol Corporation Bill [Lords]. Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills 27

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petitions for alterations; from Perth; Dingwall; Tain; and Glasgow; to lie upon the Table 27

FINANCE BILL.—Petition from Greenock, against; to lie upon the Table.. .. 27

LICENSING BILL.—Petitions against: from Dacre Banks; Heaton; Newcastle-on-Tyne; Tybie; Grantown; Castleton; Swansea (two); Manchester (four); Perth (three); Scarborough; Stirling; St. Ninians; Twerton-on-Avon; Frome (two); Bridport; Dunfermline; Ilkeston (two); Torquay (four); Sheffield; Newton St. Boswells; Eccles (two); Greenwich; Bolton (two); Whitwick (two); Weston-super-Mare; West Fife; Wells; Ludlow; Cardiff (ten); Govan (two); Wantage; Glasgow (nine); Derbyshire; Plumstead; Sunderland; Morecambe; Liverpool; Henley-on-Thames; Stourbridge; Wick; Fearn; Brinscall; Batley; Chiswick; Isle of Wight (three); Worcester; Rochdale; Westminster; Llywell; Cheam; Esher; Romford; Leytonstone; Angor Dyfi; Tain; Edinburgh (four); Urray; Muir; South West Riding of Yorkshire; Loughborough; Culbokie; Denton; Cromarty; Kirkcolm; Dartford; Knaresborough; Hugglescote; Bexley; Cupar; Tunbridge Wells; Ford; Malton; West Bristol; Tonbridge (two); Penistone; Laurencekirk; Bo'ness; Gravesend; Great Ayton; Whitby and Darlington; Stonehaven; Long Buckby; Waterbeck; Thornhill; Chelsea; Felling; Jarrow-on-Tyne; Bristol (three); Burradon; Brighton; Alloa; Hebden Bridge; New Dock; Salford; Tillicoudtry; Resolis; Cwmbran; Wishaw; Barmouth; Luton and Leighton; Torryburn; Greenock (two); South Manchester (two); East Holywell; Tudhoe; Llanelly (two); Market Lavington; Sawley; Higher Broughton; Guisborough; West Renfrew; Kilbarchan; Camberwell; Carris; Paisley (two); Galston; Baronhill; Muirkirk; South Ayrshire; Vale of Doon; Grangemouth; Denny; Stenhousemuir; Hornsey Road; Newport (Mon.); Banff; Peterhead; Elgin; Bexhill-on-Sea; Dundee (four); Crail; and Fochabers; to lie upon the Table 27

Local Authorities (Qualification of Women) Bill.—Petition from Battersea, in favour; to lie upon the Table 28

Rating of Machinery Bill.—Petitions against; from Sheffield; and Atcham; to lie upon the Table 28

May 17.] *Pa*

Re-Vaccination Bill.—Petitions against; from St. Giles; and Camberwell; to lie upon the Table 2

Re-Vaccination Bill.—Petitions in favour; from Stoke-upon-Trent; and Herefordshire County Council; to lie upon the Table 2

Tuberculosis (Animals) Compensation Bill.—Petition from Perth, against; to lie upon the Table 2

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

MINES AND QUARRIES.—Copy presented, of General Report and Statistics for the year 1902, Part IV., Colonial and Foreign Statistics; Statistics relating to Persons employed, Output, and Accidents at Mines and Quarries in the British Colonies and in Foreign Countries [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 28

RAILWAY ACCIDENTS (GENERAL REPORTS).—Copy presented, of General Report to the Board of Trade upon the Accidents that have occurred on the Railways of the United Kingdom during the year 1903 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 28

STATIONERY OFFICE (CONTROLLER'S REPORT).—Copy presented, of Fourth Report of the Controller of His Majesty's Stationery Office [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 29

ARKLOW HARBOUR.—Copy presented, of Report of the Arklow Harbour Commissioners and Statement of Accounts for 1903 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 29

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).—Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3061 to 3063 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 29

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.—Union of Benefices Act (Saint John, Fitzroy Square, with Saint Saviour, Fitzroy Square). Copy of Scheme under the Union of Benefices Act, 1860, for effecting an Union of the Benefices of Saint John, Fitzroy Square, with Saint Saviour, Fitzroy Square [by Act] 29

EXPERIMENTS ON LIVING ANIMALS.—Address for "Return showing the number of Experiments performed on Living Animals during the year 1903, under Licences granted under the Act 39 and 40 Vic., c. 77, distinguishing painless from painful Experiments (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 186, of Session 1903)."—(*Mr. Cochrane*) 30

PUBLIC REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE (ROYAL NAVY).—Return ordered, "showing the Public Revenue and Expenditure; the total value of Imports and Exports (by sea); expenditure on, or contributions to, the cost of the provision and maintenance of the Royal Navy; and the percentage proportion such expenditure or contribution bears to the total Public Revenue and to the total value of Imports and Exports (by sea) in each of the various portions of the British Empire for the latest year for which figures are available, in the following form:—

India, Colonies, and Dependencies.	1.	2.	3.	4.	Percentage proportion.	
	Total Public Revenue.	Total Public Expenditure.	Total value of Imports and Exports (by sea), including bullion and specie.	Expenditure on, or contribution to, the provision and maintenan the Royal Navy.	5. Expenditure on, or contribution to, the provision and maintenance of the Royal Navy bears to total Public Expenditure.	6. Expenditure on, or contribution to, the provision and maintenance of the Royal Navy bears to total value of Imports and Exports by sea.
India						
Self-governing Colonies						
Total India and Self-governing Colonies						
Other British Possessions						
Total other British Possessions						
		ABSTRACT.				
India						
Self-governing Colonies						
Other British Possessions						
Total						
United Kingdom						

—(*Sir John Colomb*) 30

CROWN AGENTS.—Address for "Return showing how many Firms were invited by the Crown Agents to tender for the supply of each of the following articles on the latest occasion within the last three years on which an order for considerable quantities of such articles was given by the Crown Agents—namely: Railway Rails, Steel Sleepers, Steel Bridges, Locomotives, Railway Trucks, Railway Carriages, Electric Cranes, Steam Cranes, Corrugated Iron, Iron Pipes, Cement, Telegraph Wire, Electric Cables, Telegraph Insulators, Machinery for Electric Lighting, Engine Coal, Rifles, Cartridges, and Harness."—(*Mr. Herbert Samuel*) 31

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

LONGWORTH ESTATE, COUNTY GALWAY.—Question, Mr. Roche (Galway, E.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 31

ALLEGED ILLEGAL ARREST BY THE BRITISH NORTH BORNEO COMPANY.—Question, Mr. Henniker Heaton (Canterbury); Answer, Earl Percy 31

May 17.] Pag

SALE OF ESTATES IN COUNTY KERRY.—Question, Mr. Thomas O'Donnell; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 3

NATURALISATION FEES.—Question, Mr. Shackleton (Lancashire, Clitheroe); Answer, Mr. Akers-Douglas 3

FOUNTAINS IN KENSINGTON GARDENS.—Question, Mr. Coghill (Stoke-upon-Trent); Answer, Lord Balcarres 3

INCREASED SALARIES FOR POSTAL OFFICIALS AT HASTINGS.—Question, Mr. Freeman-Thomas (Hastings); Answer, Lord Stanley 3

POSTAL COLLECTIONS—WEIGHT CONVEYED BY ONE MAN ON A TRUCK.—Question, Mr. Freeman-Thomas; Answer, Lord Stanley 3

SORTING OF PARCELS AT ST. LEONARDS-ON-SEA POST OFFICE.—Question, Mr. Freeman-Thomas; Answer, Lord Stanley 3

RECOMMENDATIONS OF EASTERN MAIL SERVICE COMMITTEE.—Question, Mr. Evelyn Cecil (Aston Manor); Answer, Lord Stanley 3

NAVY PENSIONS.—Question, Sir Carne Rasch (Essex, Chelmsford); Answer, Mr. Pretyman 3

GENERAL OFFICES FOR INDIAN ESTABLISHMENT.—Question, Sir Carne Rasch; Answer, Mr. Brodrick 36

SALARIES OF IRISH NATIONAL SCHOOL TEACHERS.—Question, Mr. Delany (Queens County, Ossory); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 36

SALE OF INTOXICANTS TO CHINESE LABOURERS IN SOUTH AFRICAN MINES.—Question, Captain Ellice (St. Andrew's Burghs); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton .. 3

WAGES OF CHINESE LABOURERS IN SOUTH AFRICA.—Question, Mr. Whitley (Halifax); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 3

RESUMED CONSIDERATION OF NEW RULES OF PROCEDURE.—Question, Mr. Whitley; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 3

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

ARMY REORGANISATION.—Question, Mr. D. A. Thomas (Merthyr Tydvil); Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Arnold-Forster, Belfast, W.) .. 3

ROCK DRILLING IN METALLIFEROUS MINES.—Question, Dr. Hutchinson (Sussex, Rye); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Lyttelton, Warwick and Leamington) 3

PROPOSED JEWISH SETTLEMENT IN EAST AFRICA.—Question, Mr. Cathcart Wason (Orkney and Shetland); Answer, The Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Earl Percy, Kensington, S.) 3

RAILWAY RATES ON GENERAL MERCHANDISE.—Question, Mr. Crombie (Kincardineshire); Answer, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Gerald Balfour, Leeds Central) 3

May 17.]

Page

MOTOR CYCLES IN THE WEST END.—Question, Mr. Cathcart Wason; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Akers Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's) 40

SIEVIER v. DUKE.—Question, Mr. Atherley-Jones (Durham, N.W.); Answer, Mr. Akers Douglas 40

RAILWAY RATES FOR FISH.—Question, Mr. Crombie; Answer, Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes (Huntingdonshire, Ramsey) 41

OLD ADMIRALTY BUILDINGS.—Question, Sir John Leng (Dundee); Answer, Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley) 41

SANITARY CONDITIONS OF DERRYGONNELLY.—Question, Mr. Edward Mitchell (Fermanagh, N.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 42

COMMISSIONERS OF EDUCATION IN IRELAND—LAND PURCHASE.—Question, Mr. Murphy (Kerry, E.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 42

LLOYD APJOHN ESTATE, COUNTY LIMERICK.—Question, Mr. Lundon (Limerick, E.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 43

AGRICULTURAL LABOURERS IN IRELAND.—Question, Mr. Lundon; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 43

KERRY FISHERIES.—Question, Mr. Flavin (Kerry, N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 44

IRISH FISHING INDUSTRY RETURN.—Questions, Mr. Flavin and Mr. Joyce (Limerick); Answers, Mr. Wyndham 44

LISTOWEL AND TARBET COACH CONTRACT.—Question, Mr. Flavin; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 45

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY.—Question, Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 45

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY CADETS.—Question, Mr. Delany; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 46

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.—Questions, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs), Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis), and Sir Walter Foster (Derbyshire, Ilkeston); Answers, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 46

NEW BILLS.

Alkali, etc., Works Bill.—"To consolidate and amend the Alkali, etc., Works Regulation Acts, 1881 and 1892," presented by Mr. Walter Long; supported by the Lord Advocate, Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland, and Mr. Grant Lawson: to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 1st June, and to be printed. [Bill 202.] 47

Naval Works (Portsmouth Barracks Site) Bill.—"For vesting in the Admiralty certain lands at Portsmouth, with the church and buildings thereon, for the purpose of, or in connection with, the erection of barracks, and for other matters incidental thereto," presented by Mr. Arthur Lee; supported by Mr. Pretyman; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 1st June, and to be printed. [Bill 201.] 47

May 17.]

Dean Forest Bill.—" To facilitate the opening and working of certain of the lower series of coal seams in His Majesty's Forest of Dean, and in the hundred of St. Briavels, in the county of Gloucester, and for certain other purposes connected with the mines in the said forest and hundred," presented by Mr. Victor Cavendish; supported by Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 1st June, and to be printed. [Bill 203.] .. 48

Architects Registration Bill.—" To provide for the registration of architects," presented by Mr. Atherley-Jones; supported by Sir William Coddington, Mr. Wallace, and Sir Christopher Furness; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 1st June, and to be printed. [Bill 204.] 48

Anglo-French Convention Bill.—" For approving and carrying into effect a Convention between His Majesty and the President of the French Republic," presented by Earl Percy; supported by Mr. A. J. Balfour and Mr. Secretary Lyttelton; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 1st June, and to be printed. [Bill 205.] 4

Poor Law Officers Superannuation (Scotland) Bill.—" To provide Superannuation Allowances to Poor Law Officers and Servants in Scotland, and for contributions towards such allowances by such officers and servants; and to make other relative provisions," presented by Mr. Maxwell; supported by Sir William Arrol, Sir Lewis McIver, Dr. Farquharson, Mr. Alexander Cross, Colonel Denny, Mr. Ure, and Sir Charles Renshaw; to be read a second time upon Monday, 4th July, and to be printed. [Bill 206.] 4

Housing of the Working Classes (Rural Districts) Bill.—" To amend The Housing of the Working Classes Act, 1890, and the acts amending the same, and the Local Government Act, 1894, so as to facilitate the provision of cottages by rural district councils," presented by Sir Walter Foster; supported by Mr. Channing, Mr. Stevenson, Mr. Pirie, Mr. Broadhurst, Mr. Frederick Wilson, Mr. Herbert Samuel, and Mr. Soames; to be read a second time upon Monday, 6th June, and to be printed. [Bill 207.] 48

MONUMENT TO THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (*Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.*) 48

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty praying that His Majesty will give directions that a monument be erected in the Collegiate Church of St. Peter, Westminster, to the memory of the late Right Hon. the Marquess of Salisbury, with an inscription expressive of the high sense entertained by the House of his rare and splendid gifts and of his devoted labours in Parliament and in great Offices of State; and to assure His Majesty that this House will make good the expenses attending the same."—(*Mr. A. J. Balfour.*)

Page
Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs) 52
Mr. John Redmond (Waterford) 53
Sir Alfred Thomas (Glamorganshire, E.) 55
Colonel Saunderson (Armagh, N.) 56

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolved, That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty praying that His Majesty will give directions that a monument be erected in the Collegiate Church of St. Peter, Westminster, to the memory of the late right hon. the Marquess of Salisbury, with an inscription expressive of the high sense entertained by the House of his rare and splendid gifts and of his devoted labours in Parliament and in great Offices of State; and to assure His Majesty that this House will make good the expenses attending the same.—(*Mr. A. J. Balfour.*)

Resolution to be reported to-morrow.

---

ance Bill.—[SECOND READING.]—Order read for resuming adjourned debate on Amendment to Question [16th May], "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Which Amendment was—

"To leave out from the word 'That,' to the end of the Question, in order to add the words 'this House, having regard to the heavy burden of taxation proposed by this Bill in a time of peace, deems it necessary to declare its condemnation of the large and continuous increase of the national expenditure in recent years.'"—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Lord Alwyne Compton (Bedfordshire, Biggleswade) 57
Sir William Harcourt (Monmouthshire, W.) 59
Mr. Chaplin (Lincolnshire, Sleaford) 70
Sir Henry Fowler (Wolverhampton, E.) 76
The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.) 88
Mr. Robson (South Shields) 102
Mr. Elliot (Durham) 108
Mr. Kearley (Devonport) 111

And, it being half-past Seven of the Clock, the debate stood adjourned until this Evening's Sitting.

EVENING SITTING.

ance Bill.—[SECOND READING.]—Order read, for resuming adjourned debate on Amendment to Question [16th May], "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Which Amendment was—

"To leave out from the word 'That,' to the end of the Question, in order to add the words, 'this House having regard to the heavy burden of taxation proposed by this Bill in a time of peace, deems t

May 18.] Page

necessary to declare its condemnation of the large and continuous increase of the national expenditure in recent years.' "—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

Question again proposed, " That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Sir Edward Sassoon (*Hythe*) 113
Mr. John Ellis (*Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe*) 116
Mr. Cust (*Southwark, Bermondsey*) 121
Mr. Goddard (*Ipswich*) 127
Sir Carne Rasch (*Essex, Chelmsford*) 131
Mr. Asquith (*Fifeshire, E.*) 132
The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (*Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.*) 139

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 297 ; Noes, 213. (Division List No. 125.)

Main Question again proposed.

Motion made and Question, " That the debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Clancy*)—put, and agreed to.

Debate to be resumed to-morrow.

Naval Works (Portsmouth Barracks Site) Bill.—Ordered, That the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills do examine the Naval Works (Portsmouth Barracks Site) Bill, with respect to compliance with the Standing Orders relative to Private Bills.—(*Mr. Pretyman.*) 156

Adjourned at a quarter after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS : WEDNESDAY, 18TH MAY, 1904.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Chesterfield Corporation (Tramways and Improvements) Bill [Lords]; Liverpool and London and Globe Insurance Company Bill [Lords]; University of Leeds Bill [Lords]; Yorktown and Blackwater Gas Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered ; to be read the third time 157

PIER AND HARBOUR PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 2)—Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade, under The General Pier and Harbour Act, 1861, relating to Hartlepool, Islay, and Waterford, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Gerald Balfour and Mr. Bonar Law.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2).—" To confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade, under The General Pier and Harbour Act, 1861, relating to Hartlepool, Islay, and Waterford," presented accordingly, and read the first time ; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills and to be printed. [Bill 208.] 157

ay 18.] *Page*

iddlesborough, Stockton-on-Tees, and Thornaby Tramways Bill.—Reported with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 157

AILWAY BILLS (GROUP No. 8).—Mr. HENRY HOBHOUSE reported from the Committee on Group No. 8 of Railway Bills; That Mr. Crean, one of the Members of the said Committee, was not present during the Sitting of the Committee on Monday last 157

Report to lie upon the Table.

PETITIONS.

DUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petitions for alteration; from Perth; and Brechin and Fordoun; to lie upon the Table 157

OME INDUSTRIES BILL.—Petition from Glasgow, against; to lie upon the Table 157

ICENSING BILL.—Petitions against; from Dreghorn; Leeds (three); Dunfermline; Preston; Ilkley; Leicester (five); Glasgow (three); Great Harwood; Leicestershire (two); Earlestown; Broughty Ferry (two); Buckie (two); Nuneaton; Evesham; Skelmanthorpe; Muswell Hill; Edinburgh (five); Saint Neots; Bolton; Clevedon; Manchester; Royston; Darton; Bury St. Edmunds; Liverpool (three); Par; Aspatria and Brayton; Gilsland; Jordan; Looe; Altrincham (two); Montrose; Walkden; Grays; Tindale; Reading; Broadheath; Lockerley; Wigan; Coalville; Brookfield; West Gorton; Tibshelf; Berwick; Dalwhinnie; Southwark; Biggar; Bellfield; Fulham; Beith; Taunton (three); Boston; Stirchley; Gillingham; Tarbert; Bacup; Exeter; National Union for the Suppression of Intemperance; Cleckheaton; Swinton; North Devon; Haslemere; Sale and Ashton on Mersey; Ibstock; Salford; Bowmore; Maryhill; Vale of Clyde; Beaufort; Oldham; Maryhill; Newbridge; Trevadoe Paul; Brierley Hill; Darvel; Wakefield (four); Peebles; Weston-super-Mare (twenty); Ackworth (three) Buccleugh; Cardiff; Nottingham (two); Bulwell; Pontypridd; Llangerriew; Birkenhead; Wrexham; Bervie; Irwell Bank; Atherstone; Dunfermline; Heywood (two); Sunningdale; Brechin and Fordoun; Hull; Llandilo (two); Burry Port; Ossett (two); New Herrington; Lewes; National United Temperance Council; Hedon; Hornsea; East Dereham; Inverleithen; Broughton; Plymouth (three); Armley; Manor Park; Forest Gate; Islington (two); Long Sutton; Street; Walton; Banff and West Aberdeen; Stockport; Heaton Norris; Wellow; Borough Market; Torquay (two); Thurlby; Devonport and Stonehouse; Keyham; Stonehouse; Devonport; Waterbeach; Cottenham; Buxton; St. Ives; Down; Rawtenstall; Eaglesfield; Lochgelly; Coaltown of Wemyss; Methil; Aberdeen (two); Lanark; Cheshire; Little Leigh; Kensington (Brecon); Breconshire; Northwich (two); Dundee (six); Great Grimsby (three); Bristol (two); Huncote; Great Wigston; Coatbridge; Portsmouth; Blaina; Old Buckenham; Kelty; Wymondham; Newtown; Shotts; Gloucester (two); Audlem; Greenbank; Aber; Ayrshire; Bradford (two); Greyton; Nitshill; Croydon (two); New Hirst; Backworth; South Aberdeen; Aspull; Spencer's Wood; New Clee and Weelsby; and Long Eaton; to lie upon the Table 157

CENSING BILL.—Petition from Hurlford, for extension of provisions to Scotland; to lie upon the Table 159

-VACCINATION BILL.—Petition from Great Yarmouth, against; to lie upon the Table 159

May 18.] *Page*

Sale of Butter Bill.—Petition from Glasgow, in favour; to lie upon the Table 159

Workmen's Compensation Bill.—Petition from Bristol, against; to lie upon the Table 159

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Harbours of Refuge.—Copy presented, of Memorandum by Commander S. C. Frederick, R.N., on the question of constructing a harbour of refuge on the north coast of Cornwall [by Command];to lie upon the Table 159

Superannuation Act, 1884.—Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 14th May, 1904, declaring that Henry Floodgate Taffs, Principal Foreman Writer, Woolwich Arsenal, War Department, was appointed without a Civil Service certificate, through inadvertence on the part of the head of the Department [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.. 159

China (No. 3, 1904).—Copy presented, of Despatch from His Majesty's Minister at Peking, inclosing a report by Mr. George J. Kidston on a journey in Mongolia [by Command]; to lie upon the Table. 159

Africa (No. 6, 1904).—Copy presented, of Convention between the United Kingdom and China respecting the employment of Chinese labour in British Colonies and Protectorates. Signed at London, 13th May, 1904 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 159

Trade Reports (Miscellaneous Series).—Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Miscellaneous Series, No. 609 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 159

Trade Reports (Annual Series).—Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3164 to 3167 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 160

Public Income and Expenditure.—Return ordered, "of net Public Income and Net Public Expenditure under certain specified heads, as represented by Receipts into and Issues out of the Exchequer from 1889–90 to 1903-4, inclusive (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 272, of Session 1903)."—(*Sir Henry Fowler.*) 160

Medical Officers of Health for Counties.—Return ordered," showing the names of the County Councils in England and Wales who have Medical Officers of Health, with the terms of the appointment (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 202, of Session 1896)."—(*Mr. Frederick Wilson.*) 160

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Army Recruiting.—Question, Sir John Colomb (Great Yarmouth); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 160

Normal Military Expenditure of France, Germany, and Russia.—Question, Mr. Runciman (Dewsbury); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 161

Sentence of Banishment on a French Woman in Jersey.—Question, Mr. Bayley (Derbyshire, Chesterfield); Answer, Mr. Akers-Douglas 163

May 18.] *Page*

HEARING OF JUVENILE CASES AT POLICE COURTS.—Question, Mr. Talbot (Oxford University); Answer, Mr. Akers-Douglas 163

FEMALE LEARNERS IN NORTH SHIELDS POST OFFICE.—Question, Mr. Robson (South Shields); Answer, Lord Stanley 164

DELAY IN COMPLETION OF TELEGRAPH CONNECTION BETWEEN MOUNTRATH AND COOLRAIN.—Question, Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory); Answer, Lord Stanley 164

POST OFFICE AND PRIVATE TELEPHONE LINES.—Question, Mr. Rigg (Westmoreland, Appleby); Answer, Lord Stanley 165

AVERAGE PRICE AND CONSUMPTION OF MEAT IN THE UNITED KINGDOM.—Question, Mr. Alfred Davies (Carmarthen Boroughs); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 166

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) FUND.—Questions, Sir Herbert Maxwell (Wigtonshire) and Sir Charles Renshaw (Renfrewshire, W.); Answers, Mr. A. Graham Murray 167

NORMAL NAVAL EXPENDITURE OF FRANCE, GERMANY, AND RUSSIA.—Question, Mr. Runciman; Answer, Mr. Pretyman 169

ROCKET AND LINE APPARATUS ON SHIPS OF WAR.—Question, Mr. Massey-Mainwaring (Finsbury, Central); Answer, Mr. Pretyman 169

ROCKET AND LINE APPARATUS ON MERCHANT SHIPS.—Question, Mr. Massey-Mainwaring; Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 169

FITZGERALD ESTATE, FURLOUGH, COUNTY MAYO.—Question, Dr. Ambrose (Mayo, W.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 170

SECOND TERM RENTS—CASE OF MR. HALPIN OF WHITESTOWN.—Question, Mr. James O'Connor (Wicklow, W.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 171

UNIFORM OF INFANTRY SERGEANTS.—Question, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 171

HEALTH OF 1ST HAMPSHIRE REGIMENT—DETENTION AT ADEN.—Question, Mr. John Hutton (Yorkshire, Richmond); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster .. 172

MESS TENTS FOR MILITIA REGIMENTS.—Question, Mr. Runciman; Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 172

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION IN THE TRANSVAAL.—Question, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Lyttelton, Warwick and Leamington) 173

CROWN AGENTS' ACCOUNTS.—Question, Sir Henry Fowler (Wolverhampton, E.); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 174

TRANSVAAL LABOUR ORDINANCE REGULATIONS.—Question, Sir Henry Fowler; Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 174

May 18.] Page

NATIVE LABOUR IN THE TRANSVAAL MINES—VIGILANCE DEPARTMENT.—Question, Mr. Herbert Samuel (Yorkshire, Cleveland); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 174

WAGES OF CHINESE LABOURERS.—Questions, Mr. Herbert Samuel, Mr. Markham (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield), Mr. Crooks (Woolwich), Mr. Whitley (Halifax), Mr. James O'Connor (Wicklow, W.), and Major Seely (Isle of Wight); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 175

AUSTRALIAN PARLIAMENT AND THE CHINESE LABOUR QUESTION.—Question, Mr. John Ellis (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 176

TRANSVAAL MAGISTRACY.—Question, Mr. John Ellis; Answer, Mr. Lyttelton .. 177

NATIVE CONVICT LABOUR IN THE MINES.—Questions, Mr. Whitley and Mr. Crooks; Answers, Mr. Lyttelton 177

BRITISH GUIANA ORDINANCE.—Question, Sir Henry Fowler; Answer, The Secretary of State for India (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford) 178

CONGO FREE STATE—CASE OF SILVANUS JONES.—Question, Mr. Cathcart Wason (Orkney and Shetland); Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Earl Percy, Kensington, S.) 178

UNCLAIMED DIVIDENDS ON GOVERNMENT STOCK.—Question, Sir John Leng (Dundee); Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.) 179

VAGRANCY ACTS.—Question, Mr. Seymour Ormsby-Gore (Lincolnshire, Gainsborough); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Akers-Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's) 179

BETHLEHEM ROYAL HOSPITAL—VIOLATION OF LUNACY ACT.—Question, Mr. Corrie Grant (Warwickshire, Rugby); Answer, Mr. Akers-Douglas 179

SALE OF ADULTERATED SEEDS.—Question, Mr. Spear (Devonshire, Tavistock); Answer, Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes (Huntingdonshire, Ramsey) 180

CHURCH ATTENDANCE OF CHILDREN IN SCHOOL HOURS.—Question, Mr. Lawrence (Liverpool, Abercromby); Answer, The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education (Sir William Anson, Oxford University) 181

AUGHRIS (SLIGO) PIER.—Question, Mr. William McKillop (Sligo, N.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 182

DUNGANNON DISTURBANCES.—Question, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 182

REDEMPTION OF CROWN AND QUIT RENTS, ETC.—Question, Mr. Gilhooly (Cork Co., W.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 183

IRISH VETERINARY DEPARTMENT.—Questions, Mr. Delany (Queen's Co., Ossory), Mr. Sloan and Mr. Flavin (Kerry, N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 183

THE MEMORIAL TO LORD SALISBURY.—Question, Dr. Farquharson (Aberdeenshire, W.); Answer, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 184

May 18.]

Page

THE TIBETAN MISSION.—Questions, Mr. Lambert (Devonshire, South Molton), and Mr. Flynn (Cork Co., N.); Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 184

THE FISCAL DEBATE.—Questions, Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis) and Mr. Markham; Answers, Mr. Speaker and Mr. A. J. Balfour 184

PUBLIC PETITIONS COMMITTEE.—Sixth Report brought up, and read; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 185

Sea Fisheries Bill [LORDS].—Read the first time; to be read a second time upon Tuesday, 31st May, and to be printed. [Bill 212] 185

NEW BILLS.

Lunacy Bill.—"To amend the Lunacy Acts," presented by Mr. Attorney-General; supported by Mr. Solicitor-General; to be read a second time upon Tuesday, 31st May, and to be printed. [Bill 210] 186

Government Ships Bill.—"To make provision with respect to ships which belong to His Majesty, or are held on behalf of or for the benefit of the Crown, but do not form part of His Majesty's Navy," presented by Mr. Pretyman; supported by Mr. Gerald Balfour and Mr. Arthur Lee; to be read a second time upon Thursday, 2nd June, and to be printed. [Bill 211] 186

MONUMENT TO THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY.—Resolution reported, "That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty praying that His Majesty will give directions that a Monument be erected in the Collegiate Church of St. Peter, Westminster, to the memory of the late Right hon. the Marquess Salisbury with an Inscription expressive of the high sense entertained by the House of his rare and splended gifts and of his devoted labours in Parliament and in great Offices of State; and to assure His Majesty that this House will make good the Expenses attending same."

Resolution agreed to.

To be presented by Privy Councillors and Members of His Majesty's Household. 186

Finance Bill—[SECOND READING].—Order read, for resuming adjourned debate on Question (16th May), "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Question again proposed.

Mr. Clancy (Dublin County, N.) 186
Mr. Waldron (Dublin, St. Stephen's Green) 204
Mr. Lough (Islington, W.) 206
Mr. T. W. Russell (Tyrone, S.) 211
Mr. T. M. Healy (Louth, N.) 216
Mr. Power (Waterford, E.) 224
Mr. Winston Churchill (Oldham) 227
Mr. Flynn (Cork Co., N.) 229

May 18.] Page

The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.) 231
Mr. T. P. O'Connor (Liverpool, Scotland) 240
Colonel Saunderson (Armagh, N.) 242
Mr. Hemphill (Tyrone, N.) 245
Sir Thomas Osmonde (Wexford, N.) 247
Mr. Field (Dublin, St. Patrick) 248

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 278; Noes, 165. (Division List No. 126).

Bill accordingly read a second time, and committed for Tuesday, 31st May.

EVENING SITTING.

FREE FOOD.

Mr. Black (Banffshire) 253
Mr. Goschen (Sussex, East Grinstead) 258

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House, believing that the protective taxation of food would be burdensome to the people and injurious to the Empire, welcomes the declarations of Ministers that the Government is opposed to such taxation."—(*Mr. Black.*) .. ..

The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 262

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'House' to the end of the Question, in order to add the words 'considers it unnecessary to discuss the question of fiscal reforms and the declaration of the Prime Minister at Sheffield on 1st October in regard to which His Majesty's Government have announced that no proposals will be laid before the present Parliament, and expressing its continued confidence in the present Administration, desires to proceed with the business proposed in the Gracious Speech from the Throne'—(*Mr. Wyndham*)—instead thereof."

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Lord Hugh Cecil (Greenwich) 266
Sir M. Hicks Beach (Bristol, W.) 272
Mr. J. Chamberlain (Birmingham, W.) 276
Lord George Hamilton (Middlesex, Ealing) 282
The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 285
Mr. Asquith (Fifeshire, E.) .. ..

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 251; Noes, 306; (Division List No. 127.)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

And, it being after Midnight, and objection being taken to further Proceeding, the debate stood adjourned.

Adjourned at a quarter after Twelve o'clock.

Page

HOUSE OF LORDS: THURSDAY, 19TH MAY, 1904.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with :—Water Orders Confirmation [H.L.]; Gas and Water Orders Confirmation [H.L.]; Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 3) [H.L.].

The same were ordered to lie on the Table 305

Derwent Valley Water Board Bill [H.L.].—Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments 305

Belfast Corporation (Tramways) Bill [H.L.].—Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments 305

Newcastle and Gateshead Water Bill [H.L.]—Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments 305

Lothians Electric Power Bill [H.L.].—Reported, with Amendments 305

Liverpool and Wigan Churches Bill [H.L.].—Reported with Amendments .. 305

Gosport Water Bill [H.L.].—Commons Amendments considered, and agreed to 305

Great Central Railway Bill.—Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Five Lords appointed a Select Committee on the Bristol Tramways (Extensions) Bill [H.L.] and other Bills, do form the Select Committee for the consideration of the Great Central Railway Bill; read, and agreed to. All Petitions referred to the Committee, with leave to the petitioners praying to be heard by counsel against the Bill to be heard as desired, as also counsel for the Bill 305

Baker Street and Waterloo Railway Bill.—The order made on Tuesday last appointing certain Lords the Select Committee to consider the Bill, discharged 305

Baker Street and Waterloo Railway Bill.—Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Five Lords appointed a Select Committee on the Manchester Corporation (General Powers) Bill [H.L.] and other Bills, do form the Select Committee for the consideration of the Baker Street and Waterloo Railway Bill; read, and agreed to. All petitions referred to the Committee, with leave to the petitioners praying to be heard by counsel against the Bill to be heard as desired, as also counsel for the Bill .. 305

Barnet District Gas and Water Bill.—[SECOND READING.]—Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Acting Chairman of Committees.*)

The Earl of Verulam 305

On Question, Motion agreed to.

Bill. Read 2ª, and committed. The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

May 19.]

Page

Crystal Palace District Gas Bill.—Read 2^{a}, and committed 306

Great Western Railway Bill [H.L.].—Filey Improvement Bill [H.L.]. Read 3^{a}, and passed, and sent to the Commons 306

Amersham, Beaconsfield, and District Water Bill.—Read 3^{a}, and passed 306

St. Marylebone Electric Lighting Bill.—Read 3^{a}, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons 306

Brymbo Water Bill.—London and India Docks Company Bill. Brought from the Commons ; read 1^{a}; and referred to the Examiners 306

Cambrian Railways Bill [H.L.].—Nuneaton and Chilvers Coton Urban District Council Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments considered, and agreed to 307

Harlow and Sawbridgeworth Gas Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons, agreed to, with Amendments 307

Ryde Gas Bill.—Returned from the Commons with the Amendment agreed to 307

Blyth and Cowper Gas Bill.—Whitby Gas Bill. Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to 307

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill.—Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill ; Local Government Provisional Order (Poor Law) Bill ; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill ; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill. Read 2^{a} (according to order), and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Thursday, the 9th of June next 307

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [H.L.].—Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [H.L.]. Read 2^{a} (according to order) 307

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (Birmingham) Bill [H.L.].—House in Committee (according to order). Bill reported without amendment ; Standing Committee negatived ; and Bill to be read 3^{a} on Tuesday the 7th of June next 307

Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 1) Bill [H.L.].—Read 3^{a} (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons 307

Private and Provisional Order Confirmation Bills.—Ordered that Standing Orders Nos. 92 and 93 be suspended ; and that the time for depositing Petitions praying to be heard against Private and Provisional Order Confirmation Bills, also the time for depositing Documents relating to any Order under The Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, which would otherwise expire during the adjournment of the House at Whitsuntide, be extended to the first day on which the House shall sit after the Recess 307

May 19.]

Page

PETITIONS.

Weights and Measures (Metric System) Bill [h.l.].—Petition in favour of; of Durham County Council; read, and ordered to lie on the Table 308

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Board of Education.—Regulations of the Board of Education, dated 13th May, 1904, providing for grants on account of the education of defective and epileptic children, and prescribing conditions to be fulfilled by certified schools for such children 308

Trade Reports—I. Annual Series.

No. 3164. France (French Indo-China).

No. 3165. Spain (Galicia, Asturias, Leon).

No. 3166. Greece (Piræus and District).

No. 3167. Persia (Kerman and District) 308

II. Miscellaneous Series.—No. 609. Germany (Technical Instruction in Naval Architecture and Engineering) 308

Commercial, No. 4 (1904).—Suez Canal. Returns of shipping and tonnage 1901, 1902, and 1903 (in continuation of Commercial, No. 4, 1903) 308

China, No. 3 (1904).—Despatch from His Majesty's Minister at Pekin enclosing a Report by Mr. George J. Kidston on a journey in Mongolia 308

Africa, No. 6 (1904).—Convention between the United Kingdom and China respecting the employment of Chinese labour in British Colonies and Protectorates; signed at London, 13th May, 1904 308

Harbours of Refuge.—Memorandum, by Commander G. C. Frederick, R.N., on the question of constructing a harbour of refuge on the north coast of Cornwall.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 309

Foreign Jurisdiction Act.—Order in Council of the 16th May, 1904, entitled "The Bechuanaland Protectorate (Lands) Order in Council, 1904" 309

Intermediate Education (Ireland).—Rules and programme of examinations for 1905 309

Superannuation.—Treasury Minute, dated 14th May, 1904, declaring that Henry Floodgate Taffs, Principal Foreman Writer, Woolwich Arsenal, War Department, was appointed without a Civil Service certificate, through inadvertence on the part of the head of his Department.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table .. 309

Light Railways Bill [h.l.].—A Bill to continue and amend the Light Railways Act, 1896—Was presented by the Lord Wolverton; read 1^a; and to be printed. (No. 83) 309

May 19.] *Page*

Prevention of Corruption Bill [H.L.].—Read 3ª (according to order); an Amendment (Privilege) made; Bill passed, and sent to the Commons .. 309

Bills of Exchange Act, 1882, Amendment Bill [H.L.]; PRIZE COURTS BILL [H.L.].—Read 3ª (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons 309

Street Betting Bill [H.L.]—Amendments reported (according to order), and Bill to be read 3ª on Tuesday, the 7th June next 309

COTTON AS CONTRABAND OF WAR.

The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (The Marquess of Lansdowne) 309

THE IMPERIAL YEOMANRY.

Lord Lovat 310
Lord Harris 314
Lord Grenfell 316
The Earl of Erroll 317
Lord Wenlock 319
The Under-Secretary of State for War (The Earl of Donoughmore) .. 320
Viscount Galway 324
Lord Monkswell 325
Lord Denman 326
Earl Carrington 327
The Marquess of Lansdowne 328

THE IRISH LAND ACT.

The Earl of Westmeath 330
The Earl of Denbigh 335

House adjourned at twenty-five minutes past Five o'clock to Tuesday, 7th of June next, a quarter past Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: THURSDAY, 19TH MAY, 1904.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS (NO STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE).—MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, referred on the First Reading thereof, no Standing Orders are applicable, viz.:—

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 14) Bill.

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time upon Tuesday, 31st May .. 337

Blyth and Cowpen Gas Bill.—Whitby Gas Bill. Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to 338

Harlow and Sawbridgeworth Gas Bill [LORDS].—Nuneaton and Chilvers Coton Urban District Council Bill [Lords]. Read the third time and passed, with Amendments 338

May 19.]

Page

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.—Ordered That Standing Orders 39, 128, and 230 be suspended, and that the time for depositing Petitions and Memorials against Private Bills, or against any Bill to confirm any Provisional Order or Provisional Certificate, and for depositing duplicates of any Documents relating to any Bill to confirm any Provisional Order or Provisional Certificate, also for depositing at the Private Bill Office all Documents relating to any Order under The Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, be extended to the first day on which the House shall sit after the Recess.—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means*) 338

DRAINAGE AND IMPROVEMENT OF LANDS (IRELAND) PROVISIONAL ORDER.—Bill to confirm a Provisional Order, under The Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Act, 1863, and the Acts amending the same, relating to the Farney Bridge and Ballynahow Drainage District, in the county of Tipperary, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Victor Cavendish and Mr. Wyndham.

Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Provisional Order Bill.—"To confirm a Provisional Order, under The Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Act, 1863, and the Acts amending the same, relating to the Farney Bridge and Ballynahow Drainage District, in the county of Tipperary," presented accordingly and read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills and to be printed. [Bill 213] 338

PAISLEY DISTRICT TRAMWAYS ORDER CONFIRMATION.—Bill to confirm a Provisional Order, under The Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, relating to Paisley District Tramways, ordered to be brought in by The Lord Advocate and Mr. A. Graham Murray.

Paisley District Tramways Order Confirmation Bill.—"To confirm a Provisional Order, under The Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, relating to Paisley District Tramways," presented accordingly; and ordered to be considered upon Tuesday, 31st May 338

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to—Amersham, Beaconsfield, and District Water Bill, without Amendment.

Chippenham Gas Bill, with Amendments.

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confirm a Provisional Order made by the Board of Trade under The General Pier and Harbour Act, 1861, relating to Wexford. [Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 1) Bill [Lords].

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act for conferring further powers upon the Great Western Railway Company in respect of their own undertaking, and upon that Company and the London and North Western Railway Company in respect of undertakings in which they are jointly interested, and upon the Great Western and Great Central Railways Joint Committee in respect of their undertakings; for authorising the abandonment of the Somersetshire Coal Canal and the vesting of the site thereof in the Great Western Railway Company; for amalgamating the Abingdon Railway Company with the Great Western Railway Company; and for other purposes." [Great Western Railway Bill [Lords].

May 19.] *Page*

And, also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confer further powers on the Urban District Council of Filey, in the East Riding of the County of York, in relation to their gas and water undertakings and in relation to the seashore, and to make further and better provision for the improvement, health, local government, and finance of the district; and for other purposes." [Filey Improvement Bill [Lords] 339

Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 1) Bill [Lords].—Read the first time; referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 214] 339

Great Western Railway Bill [Lords].—Filey Improvement Bill [Lords]. Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills 340

PETITIONS.

Education (Scotland) Bill.—Petitions for alteration; from Blair Atholl; Logiewait; and Paisley; to lie upon the Table 340

Licensing Bill.—Petitions against; from Cardiff (eleven); Rhydwyn; Wolverton; Manchester and Salford; Llanfechell; Southampton (three); Cowbridge Road; Bodedeon; Duns and Chirnside; Holyhead; Shirley; Kingston upon-Hull; Barry; New Milns; Findhorn; Cranford; Tonyrefail (two); Cadoxton (two); Hafodyrynys; Bridgend; Brymbo; Brynteg; Greave Fold; Woodley; Noddfa; Gee Cross; Black Isle; Boundary Street East; Halifax; Scone; Pwllheli; Bishopsgate; Canning Town; Lee and Hither Green; Glasgow (five); Greenock (five); Stratford (three); Wrexham; Custom House; Devonport; Pontmorwrid; Upton Manor; Barking Road (two); Plaistow; Silvertown; Coneysthorpe; Stamford; Silver Stream; Penysarn; Brampton; Birmingham (five); Hockley; Faversham; Altrincham; Roath Park; Preston; Reading; Peddieston; North Wales Women's Temperance Union; Cemaes Bay; Crouch End; Old Fletton; Glossop; Nottingham (two); Holloway; Gomersal; Sandhurst; Camberley and York; Mirfield; Darvil; Perth; Chichester; Tenby; Aberdeen; Leith (two); Musselburgh (two); Arthog; Derby (two); Stratford New Town; West Ham; Ardrishaig; Easdale; Great Waltham; Kelso; Tighnabruaich; Dunoon; Nelson; Badsey; Aston Park; Leominster; Clayton West; Johnstown; Frenchay; Richmond Road; Blaenavon; Swansea; Canning Town; Wyke; Ashton in Makerfield; Campbeltown; Cwmbwrla; Rhyddings; Sparkhill; Ayr (two); Blaydon on Tyne; Newtown; Garesfield; Stapleton; Ashby de la Zouch; Smarden; Dollar; Street; Silverton; Cwmbran (Monmouth) (four); New Silksworth; Kinross; North West Gloucester; Liverpool; Manchester (two); Beaminster; Troedyrhiew (two); Merthyr; Somerset; New Lambton; Forest Gate; Sunderland (two); Margrove Park; New Hirst; Leigh; Cullen; Stevenston; Barrhead; Johnstone; South Forfar; Kirkwall; and Edinburgh; to lie upon the Table 340

Sunday Trading (Scotland) Bill.—Petition from Aberdeen, in favour; to lie upon the Table 341

Tuberculosis (Animals) Compensation Bill.—Petitions against; from Paisley; and Ayr; to lie upon the Table 341

Valuation Bill.—Petition from King's Lynn, against; to lie upon the Table .. 341

May 19.]

Page

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES BILL.—Petition from Sunderland, for alteration; to lie upon the Table 341

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION BILL.—Petition from Bristol against; to lie upon the Table 341

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION (IRELAND).—Copy presented, of Rules and Programme of Examinations for 1905 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 180] 341

IRISH LAND ACT, 1903.—Copy ordered, " of Returns (1) of estates sold to persons other than the Land Commission; (2) of applications for advances lodged where sales have not yet been completed; (3) of proceedings under various sections of the Irish Land Act, 1903; (4) of applications for advances entirely or partly refused; (5) of sales in the Land Judge's Court to persons other than the Land Commission; (6) of estates of lunatics sold with the sanction of the Lord Chancellor of Ireland; all in respect of the period of six months ended 30th April, 1904"—(*Mr Wyndham*)

Copy presented accordingly; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 181.] 341

LAND JUDGE'S COURT (IRELAND).—Copy ordered, " of a Return, by Counties, of the Estates in the Land Judge's Court over which receivers have been appointed."—(*Mr. Wyndham.*)

Copy presented accordingly; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 182.] 342

BOARD OF EDUCATION.—Copy presented, of Regulations of the Board of Education, dated 13th May, 1904, providing for Grants on Account of the Education of Defective and Epileptic Children, and prescribing conditions to be fulfilled by certified schools for such children [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 342

FOREIGN JURISDICTION ACT, 1890.—Copy presented, of Order in Council of 16th May, 1904, entitled the Bechuanaland Protectorate (Lands) Order in Council 1904 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 342

EXPERIMENTS ON LIVING ANIMALS.—Return presented, relative thereto [Address 17th May; *Mr. Cochrane*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 183] 342

SUEZ CANAL (COMMERCIAL, No. 4, 1904).—Copy presented, of Returns of Shipping and Tonnage, 1901, 1902, and 1903 (in continuation of " Commercial, No. 4, 1903") [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 342

BRITISH GUIANA ORDINANCE, 1891.—Address for " Copy of the Correspondence between the India Office and the Colonial Office, with reference to the British Guiana Ordinance, 1891."—(*Sir Henry Fowler*) 342

EAST INDIA (FINANCIAL STATEMENT).—Address for " Return of Indian Financial Statement for 1904–5, and of the Proceedings of the Legislative Council of the Governor-General thereon."—(*Sir Henry Fowler.*) 342

May 19.] Page

ARRESTS FOR DRUNKENNESS (IRELAND).—Return ordered, " giving the number of Arrests for Drunkenness within the Metropolitan Police District of Dublin and the cities of Belfast, Cork, Limerick, and Waterford, from the hour of 8 a.m on Sunday till 2 p.m., from 2 p.m., to 7 p.m., from 7. p.m. to 9 p.m., from 9 p.m. to 12 midnight, from 12 midnight to 8 a.m. on Monday, between the 1st day of May, 1903, and the 30th day of April, 1904, both days inclusive, the Arrests being given from 8 a.m. on Sundays till 8 a.m. on Mondays."

" And, similar Returns for the rest of Ireland from the 1st day of May, 1903, to the 30th day of April, 1904."—(*Mr. Sloan*) 342

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill.—Copy ordered, " of Memorandum stating the nature of the Proposals contained in the Provisional Orders included in the Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill."—(*Mr. Bonar Law*) 343

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill.—Copy ordered, " of Memorandum stating the nature of the proposals contained in the Provisional Orders included in the Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill."—(*Mr. Bonar Law*) 343

INDIAN ARMY (MEMORANDUM).—Address for " Return of the Memorandum recently issued by General Lord Kitchener of Khartoum, and the local Commander-in-Chief in India upon the organisation and training of the Army in India, and the necessity for the whole of the European male population to be practised to arms in the Volunteer Force."—(*Sir Howard Vincent*) .. 343

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

INADEQUATE PIER ACCOMMODATION AT BUNCRANA.—Question, Mr. O'Doherty (Donegal, N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 343

MR. S. W. ADAMS' ESTATE, NEAR MILLSTREET, CO. CORK.—Question, Mr. Flynn (Cork Co., W.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 344

STRENGTH OF ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY IN COUNTY CORK.—Question, Mr. Flynn; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 344

COTTON CORNERS—ACTION OF UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT.—Question, Mr. Field (Dublin, St. Patrick); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 345

TENDERS FOR BATTLESHIP ARMOUR.—Question, Mr. J. F. Hope (Sheffield, Brightside); Answer, Mr. Pretyman 345

EDUCATIONAL VALUE OF VIVISECTION.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, Mr. Akers-Douglas 346

FACTORY ACT, 1901—SECTION 61.—Question, Mr. Shackleton (Lancashire, Clitheroe); Answer, Mr. Akers-Douglas 346

MOTOR CARS ACT—TRADERS' LICENCES.—Question, Mr. Scott-Montague (Hampshire, New Forest); Answer, Mr. Akers-Douglas 347

SECOND DIVISION CLERKS ON TEMPORARY DUTY.—Question, Mr. Crooks, (Woolwich); Answer, Mr. Victor Cavendish 347

May 19.]

Page

REPLY TO MEMORIALS OF ASSISTANT CLERKS.—Question, Mr. Ernest Gray (West Ham, N.); Answer, Mr. Victor Cavendish 349

DUBLIN TELEGRAPH OFFICE—PUBLIC CROSS-EXAMINATION OF OFFICIALS.—Question Mr. Nannetti (Dublin, College Green); Answer, Lord Stanley 349

VACANT POSTMASTERSHIP OF ENNIS.—Question, Mr. Nannetti; Answer, Lord Stanley 349

POST OFFICE HOURS OF COLLECTION PLATES—ALLEGED INACCURACIES IN THE W.C. DISTRICT.—Question, Mr. H. J. Wilson (Yorkshire, W.R., Holmfirth); Answer, Lord Stanley 349

ESTABLISHMENT OF A CONSULAR COURT IN THE CONGO STATE.—Question, Mr. Jacoby (Derbyshire, Mid.); Answer, Earl Percy 350

REPORT ON INDIAN POLICE.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. Brodrick .. 350

INDIAN OFFICIAL SECRETS BILL—POINT OF OBJECTIONS.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. Brodrick 350

PUBLICATION OF LORD KITCHENER'S MEMORANDUM ON THE INDIAN ARMY.—Question, Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield, Central); Answer, Mr. Brodrick .. 351

IRELAND—OFFICE OF PUBLIC TRUSTEE.—Question, Mr. Patrick O'Brien (Kilkenny); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 351

CLARE AGRICULTURAL COMMITTEE—APPOINTMENT OF MISS FREEMAN.—Question, Mr. William Redmond (Clare, E.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 351

NEW COURSE FOR ADMISSION TO THE ARMY.—Question, Sir Howard Vincent; Answer, Mr. Arnold Forster 352

RIFLE RANGE ACCOMMODATION AT RUGBY.—Question, Mr. Corrie Grant (Warwickshire, Rugby); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 353

ARMY PENSIONS—CASE OF MATTHEW MEATH.—Question, Mr. Nolan (Louth, S.); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 354

PRIVATE SOLDIERS DISCHARGED ON PERMANENT PENSIONS.—Question, Mr. Nolan; Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 354

PUBLIC WORKS LOANS—EXTENSION OF TIME OF REPAYMENTS.—Question, Mr. Crooks; Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 355

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

MILITIA ENCAMPMENT DINING TENTS.—Questions, Mr. Lyell (Dorsetshire, E.) and Mr. Courtney Warner (Staffordshire, Lichfield); Answers, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Arnold-Forster, Belfast, W.) 355

ARMY EXPENDITURE.—Questions, Mr. A. K. Loyd (Berkshire, Abingdon); Answers, Mr. Arnold-Foster 356

CHINESE COOLIES FOR THE TRANSVAAL—ACCOMMODATION AT HONG KONG.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Lyttelton, Warwick and Leamington) 356

May 19.] Page

BRITISH INDIAN TRADERS IN THE TRANSVAAL.—Questions, Sir Mancherjee Bhownaggree (Bethnal Green, N.E.) and Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis); Answers, Mr. Lyttelton 357

THE TIBETAN EXPEDITION.—Questions, Mr. Flynn (Cork, N.); Answers, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Earl Percy, Kensington, S.) .. 358

PERJURY IN THE CLERKENWELL COUNTY COURT.—Question, Mr. Bryn Roberts (Carnarvonshire, Eifion); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Akers Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's) 359

POST OFFICE VOTE—SUBHEAD E II.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, The Postmaster-General (Lord Stanley, Lancashire, Westhoughton) 359

LIGHT DUES.—Questions, Sir Albert Rollet (Islington, S.) and Mr. Austin Taylor (Liverpool, E. Toxteth); Answers, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Gerald Balfour, Leeds, Central(.. 360

BRIGHTON VACCINATION REGULATIONS.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Walter Long, Bristol, S.) .. 361

BUCKINGHAM COUNTY COUNCIL RATE.—Question, Mr. Alfred Davies; Answer, Mr. Walter Long 361

GRANTS TO ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS.—Questions, Sir W. Hart Dyke (Kent, Dartford) and Sir Henry Hobhouse (Somersetshire, E.); Answers, The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education (Sir William Anson, Oxford University) 361

ROADS AT LOCHS, ISLAND OF LEWIS.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. Graham Murray, Buteshire) 362

DUBLIN COLLEGE OF SCIENCE—ARCHITECT'S REMUNERATION.—Question, Mr. Mooney (Dublin County, S.); Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Victor Cavendish, Derbyshire, W.) 363

THE KINGSTON ESTATE.—Question, Mr. William Abraham (Cork County, N.E.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 363

BICYCLE THEFTS IN DUBLIN.—Question, Mr. Mooney; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 364

COOSCROOM LANDING STAGE.—Question, Mr. Boland (Kerry, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 364

ASSISTANT TEACHERS IN IRISH NATIONAL SCHOOLS.—Question, Mr. Murphy (Kerry, E.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 365

KILLORGLIN EVICTED TENANTS.—Question, Mr. Murphy; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 365

LISTOWEL AND TARBERT COACH CONTRACT.—Question, Mr. Flavin (Kerry, N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 365

NORTH KERRY FISHERIES.—Question, Mr. Flavin; Answer, Mr. Wyndham .. 366

BALLINASLOE ASYLUM MEDICAL OFFICER.—Questions, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.), and Mr. T. M. Healy (Louth, N.); Answers, Mr. Wyndham 366

May 19.] *Page*

MARINE INSURANCE BILL.—Question, Sir Albert Rollit; Answer, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 368

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.—That they have passed a Bill, intituled, " An Act for rendering compulsory the use of the system of Weights and Measures commonly known as the Metric System." [Weights and Measures (Metric System) Bill [Lords].

Also, a Bill, intituled, " An Act for the Better Prevention of Corruption." [Prevention of Corruption Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, " An Act to amend Section eighty-two of the Bills of Exchange Act, 1882." [Bills of Exchange Act, 1882, Amendment Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, " An Act for amending the Law relating to the Administration of Oaths for the purpose of Proceedings in Prize Courts." [Prize Courts Bill [Lords.] 368

NEW BILL.

Judicature and Development Grant (Ireland) Bill.—" To augment the Ireland Development Grant by means of the abolition of two Judgeships and the reduction of the Salary of the Lord Chancellor, and the transfer of certain Accumulations, and to make provision with respect to the application of a portion of that grant," presented by Mr. Wyndham; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 1st June, and to be printed. [Bill 215.]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (SUPPLY).

Ordered, That the Motion for the Adjournment of the House for Whitsuntide have precedence this day of the Business of Supply.—(*Mr. A. J. Balfour*).

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE (WHITSUNTIDE).

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 31st May."—(*Sir A. Acland-Hood*).

Dr. Farquharson (Aberdeenshire, W.) 369
The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 370
Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis) 375
Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs) 380
Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) 383
Sir Edward Sassoon (Hythe) 386
Mr. Herbert Samuel (Yorkshire, Cleveland) 386
The President of the Local Government (Mr. Walter Long, Bristol, S.) .. 388
Mr. Sydney Buxton (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) 389
Mr. Joseph Walton (Yorkshire, W.R., Barnsley) 390
Major Seely (Isle of Wight) 392
The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Lyttelton, Warwick and Leamington) 393
Mr. J. A. Pease (Essex, Saffron Walden) 396
Mr. Lloyd George (Carnarvon Boroughs) 396
Mr. T. W. Russell (Tyrone, S.) 399

Mr. Boland (Kerry, S.) 401
Mr. Flavin (Kerry, N.) 401
The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 402
Mr. T. P. O'Connor (Liverpool, Scotland) 404
Mr. Hemphill (Tyrone, N.) 406
Mr. Shackleton (Lancashire, Clitheroe) 407
Mr. Stevenson (Suffolk, Eye) 409
The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Earl Percy, Kensington, S.) 410
Mr. Alfred Davies (Carmarthen Boroughs) 414
Mr. Bryce (Aberdeen, S.) 415
The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Akers-Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's) 417
Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty) 418
The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. Graham Murray, Buteshire) 419
Mr. J. H. Lewis (Flint Boroughs) 419
The Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasury (Sir A. Acland-Hood, Somersetshire, Wellington) 420

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolved, That this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 31st May.—(*Sir A. Acland-Hood.*)

Adjourned at twenty-five minutes after Seven o'clock till Tuesday, 31st May.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: TUESDAY, 31ST MAY, 1904.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Croydon Gas Bill.—Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to 421

Elysée Palace Hotel Company Bill [LORDS].—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 421

Govan Burgh (Electricity) Bill [LORDS].—Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment 421

Liverpool and London and Globe Insurance Company Bill [LORDS]; University of Leeds Bill [Lords]; Yorktown and Blackwater Gas Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 421

Carlisle Corporation Bill.—As amended, considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time 421

London County Council (Tramways and Improvements) Bill.—As amended to be considered To-morrow 421

Lytham Improvement Bill; Radcliffe Tramways and Improvement Bill. As amended, considered; to be read the third time 421

Cardiff Railway Bill [Lords]; Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire Electric Power Bill [Lords]; Great Yarmouth Corporation Bill [Lords]; Leicestershire and Warwickshire Electric Power Bill [Lords]; Marylebone Chapels (Saint James, Westmoreland Street) Bill [Lords]; Minehead Urban District Council Water Bill [Lords]; West Riding Tramways Bill [Lords]. Read a second time, and committed .. 421

Paisley District Tramways Order Confirmation Bill.—Considered; to be read the third time upon Thursday .. 421

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 14) Bill.—Read a second time, and committed .. 421

PETITIONS.

Education (Scotland) Bill.—Petition from Ardeonaig, for alteration; to lie upon the Table .. 422

Electric Lighting (London) Bill.—Petition of the County of London and Brush Provincial Electric Lighting Company, Limited, against alteration (praying to be heard by Counsel): referred to the Select Committee on the Bill .. 422

Licensing Bill.—Petitions against; from Paisley (three); Birmingham; Newcastle-on-Tyne; Washaway; Burnley; Thomas Parr and another; Evesham; Gosport (two); Maryhill; Marple (two); Torquay; East Dulwich; Burra Isle; Llandudno; Llanberis; Hirael (two); Bangor (four); Pwllheli (three); Griffin; Degarnog; Leamington Spa; Grange; Banchory (two); Dunoon; Camberwell Green; Conway (two); Coventry; Stonehaven; St. Ternan; Linacre (three); Hereford (six); East Parley; Rothesay; Carnarvon; Brixham; Bute; Llandudno Junction; Carlisle; Welburn; Lochbroom; Dingwall; Invergordon; Ullapool; Frant; Penibont; Staines; Bolton; Bulmer; Slingsby; Sheriff Hutton; Kingussie; Stratford (two); West Ham; Rishton; Batton; London (two); Redcar (four); Llanelly (three); City Road; Pembroke; Colne; Abbeygreen; Nelson; Glasgow (seven); South London; Wigton (two); Edgworth; Stone; Waverton; Tunstall; Paddington; Penrith; Burbank (two); St. Ives (Hunts); Harpenden; Easton; Wood Green; Bristol (two); Coppenhall; Sandbach; Dukinfield; East Bristol; Histon; Ashton-under-Lyne; Port Glasgow; Cullompton; Ilkley; Sparkhill; Kings Heath; Alva; Kinross; Kincardine; Alloa; Gartmorn; Westbury-on-Trym; Chelsea; Taunton (three); Chester-le-Street; Willaston; Newcastle-on-Tyne; Ullapool; Crewe; Lochee; Clackmannan; Radnor; and Battersea; to lie upon the Table .. 422

Port of London Bill.—Petition from Tottenham against; to lie upon the Table .. 422

Shop Hours Bill.—Petition from Glasgow, in favour; to lie upon the Table .. 423

Tuberculosis (Animals) Compensation Bill.—Petition of the London County Council, against (praying to be heard by Counsel); to lie upon the Table .. 423

Valuation Bill.—Petitions for alteration; from Dover; Pontefract; Narberth; Brackley; Stokesley; and Cardigan; to lie upon the Table .. 423

May 31.] *Page*

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

The following Papers, presented by Command of His Majesty during the Whitsuntide Recess, were delivered to the Librarian of the House of Commons during the Recess, pursuant to the Standing Order of the 14th August, 1896 :— 423

Trade Reports (Annual Series).—Copies of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3168 to 3174 423

Colonial Reports (Annual).—Copy of Colonial Report, No. 415 (Falkland Islands, Annual Report for 1903) 423

Transvaal (Magistrates).—Copy of Despatch from the Governor of the Transvaal enclosing a Return with regard to the Magistrates of the Colony 423

Fishery Board (Scotland).—Copy of Twenty-second Annual Report of the Fishery Board for Scotland, being for the year 1903. Part II., Salmon Fisheries 423

Mines and Quarries.—Copy of Report to the Secretary of State for the Home Department by J. S. Haldane, Esq., M.D., F.R.S., J.S. Martin, Esq., His Majesty's Inspector of Mines, and R. A. Thomas, Esq., on the health of Cornish Miners 423

Militia and Volunteers (Royal Commission).—Copy of Report of the Royal Commission on the Militia and Volunteers 424

Tuberculosis (Human and Bovine) (Royal Commission).—Copy of Interim Report of the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the relations of Human and Animal Tuberculosis 424

Irish Land Commission (Proceedings).—Copy of Return of Proceedings during the month of January, 1904. 424

Dublin Metropolitan Police.—Copy of Statistical Tables for the year 1903 424

Marriages, Births, and Deaths (Ireland).—Copy of Supplement to the Thirty-seventh Report of the Registrar-General of Marriages, Births, and Deaths in Ireland, containing Decennial Summaries for the years 1891–1900.

Ordered, That the said Papers do lie upon the Table 424

Fee Fund (House of Lords).—Account presented, of the Fee Fund of the House of Lords from 1st April, 1903, to 31st March, 1904 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 424

National Portrait Gallery.—Copy presented, of Forty-seventh Annual Report of the Trustees of the National Portrait Gallery, 1903–4 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 424

Superannuation Act, 1884.—Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 26th May, 1904, declaring that Thomas Tootell, Letter Carrier, Post Office, was appointed without a Civil Service Certificate through inadvertence on the part of the Head of his Department [by Act]; to lie upon the Table .. 424

May 31.] *Page*

UGANDA RAILWAY ACTS, 1896 AND 1902.—Account presented, showing the Money issued from the Consolidated Fund under the provisions of the Uganda Railway Acts, 1896 (59 and 60 Vic., c. 38) and 1902 (2 Edw. 7, c. 40), and of the Money expended and borrowed, and Securities created under the said Acts, to 31st March, 1903, together with the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General thereon [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 184.] 424

POST OFFICE (MONEY ORDERS).—Copy presented, of the Postal Order (Sierra Leone) Regulations, 1904, dated 18th May, 1904 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 425

BRITISH GUIANA ORDINANCE, 1891.—Return presented, relative thereto [Address 19th May; *Sir Henry Fowler*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 185.] 425

EAST INDIA (PROGRESS AND CONDITION).—Copy presented, of Statement exhibiting the Moral and Material Progress and Condition of India during the year 1902–3. Thirty-ninth Number [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 186.] 425

SOUTHERN RHODESIA.—Copy presented, of Correspondence relating to the proposed introduction of Indentured Asiatic (Chinese) Labour into Southern Rhodesia [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 425

PRIVATE LEGISLATION PROCEDURE (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1899.—Copy presented, of Report by the Chairman of Committees of the House of Lords and the Chairman of Ways and Means in the House of Commons, under the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, that they are of opinion that the provisions of the Loch Leven Water Power Order, and of the Loch Leven Water Power (Extension of Time) Order are of such a character that they ought to be dealt with by Private Bills and not by Provisional Orders [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 187.] 425

FRANCE (No. 2, 1904).—Copy presented, of Notes exchanged between the Marquess of Lansdowne and the French Ambassador on Signature of the Convention and Declarations of 8th April, 1904 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 425

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).—Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, No. 3175 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 426

COUNTY COURTS (IRELAND) REGISTRARS (SALARIES, ETC.)—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 11th May; *Mr. Condon*]; to lie upon the Table .. 426

BANKING AND RAILWAY STATISTICS (IRELAND).—Copy presented, of Report on the Banking and Railway Statistics of Ireland for the half-year ended 31st December, 1903 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 426

DISEASES OF ANIMALS ACTS.—Copy presented, of Report of Proceedings by the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction for Ireland, under the Diseases of Animals Acts, for the year 1903 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 426

May 31.] Page

LABOURERS' COTTAGES (IRELAND).—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 22nd March ; *Mr. O'Shaughnessy*] ; to lie upon the Table 426

MERCANTILE MARINE (SIGHT TESTS).—Copy presented, of Report on the Sight Tests used in the Mercantile Marine for the year ended 31st December, 1903 [by Command] ; to lie upon the Table 426

STRIKES AND LOCK-OUTS.—Copy presented, of Report on the Strikes and Lock-outs of 1903, and on Conciliation and Arbitration Boards [by Command] ; to lie upon the Table 426

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

LUNATIC ASYLUMS.—Question, Mr. Charles Hobhouse (Bristol, E.) ; Answer, Mr. Akers-Douglas 426

WESTMINSTER BRIDGE TRAMWAY TERMINUS.—Question, Captain Jessel (St. Pancras, S.) ; Answer, Mr. Akers-Douglas 427

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION AMENDMENT BILL—DATE OF INTRODUCTION.—Question, Mr. J. F. Hope (Sheffield Brightside) ; Answer, Mr. Akers-Douglas 427

MANUFACTURE OF ANTITOXIN SERUM.—Question, Mr. Cameron (Durham, Houghton-le-Spring) ; Answer, Mr. Akers-Douglas 428

MAIL STEAMSHIP SUBSIDIES.—P. and O. CONTRACT.—Question, Mr. H. C. Richards (Finsbury, E.) ; Answer, Lord Stanley 428

POSTAL GRATUITIES FOR THOSE NOT ENTITLED TO PENSIONS—AMOUNT TO BE DISTRIBUTED IN IRELAND.—Question, Major Jameson (Clare, W.) ; Answer, Lord Stanley 429

SALE OF THE BALLYRANKIN ESTATE, CO. WEXFORD.—Question, Mr. William Redmond (Clare, E.) ; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 430

FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF MALTA.—Question, Mr. Boland (Kerry, S.) ; Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 430

PRESS OFFENCES IN MALTA.—Question, Mr. Boland ; Answer, Mr. Lyttelton .. 430

VALUE OF COMMERCE BETWEEN MALTA AND ITALY.—Question, Mr. Boland ; Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 431

BRITISH SUBJECTS IN EGYPT AND THE SOUDAN.—Question, Mr. Boland ; Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 431

VALUE OF GOODS SUPPLIED AND COMMISSION CHARGED BY THE CROWN AGENTS TO MALTA.—Question, Mr. Boland ; Answer, Mr. Lyttelton.. 432

CHANGES IN THE MALTESE CONSTITUTION.—Question, Mr. Boland ; Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 432

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

CHINESE LABOUR IN THE TRANSVAAL.—Question, Mr. Whitley (Halifax); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Lyttelton, Warwick and Leamington) 434

THE MISSION TO TIBET.—Questions, Mr. Herbert Roberts (Denbighshire, W.) and Mr. Lough (Islington, W.); Answers, The Secretary of State for India (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford) 434

THE NATIONAL MEMORIAL TO LORD SALISBURY.—Questions, Dr. Farquharson (Aberdeenshire, W.); Answers, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 435

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.—Questions, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) and Mr. Lough; Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 436

NEW WRIT.—New Writ for the County of Cavan (West Cavan), in the room of Thomas McGovern, esquire, deceased.—(*Mr. Patrick O'Brien.*)

SUPPLY [10TH ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[MR. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1904–5—REVENUE DEPARTMENTS.

1. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £569,000, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Customs Departments."

Mr. Whitley (Halifax) 437

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Item A, 1 (Superintending Establishment, Salaries and Allowances) be reduced by £1,000."—(*Mr. Whitley.*)

Sir E. Durning-Lawrence (Cornwall, Truro) 439
Mr. Claude Hay (Shoreditch, Hoxton) 439
Mr. Ernest Gray (West Ham, N.) 439
The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Victor Cavendish, Derbyshire, W.) 441
Mr. Cohen (Islington, E.) 442
Mr. J. F. Hope (Sheffield, Brightside) 443
Mr. Maconochie (Aberdeenshire, E.) 444
Mr. Whitley 445
Mr. Charles Devlin (Galway) 445
Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis) 446

May 31.] *Page*

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 55 ; Noes, 110. (Division List No. 128.)

Original Question again proposed.

Mr. J. H. Lewis (Flint Boroughs) .. 447
Mr. Gibson Bowles .. 449
Mr. Courtenay Warner (Staffordshire, Lichfield) .. 450
Major Evans Gordon (Tower Hamlets, Stepney) .. 450

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That Item B, 1 (Port Establishment, Salaries and Allowances) be reduced by £100."—(*Major Evans Gordon.*)

Mr. Munro Ferguson (Leith Burghs) .. 455
Mr. William Rutherford (Liverpool, West Derby) .. 456
Mr. Cathcart Wason (Orkney and Shetland) .. 456
The Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasury (Sir A. Acland-Hood, Somersetshire, Wellington) .. 457
Captain Norton (Newington, W.) .. 457
Mr. Causton (Southwark, W.) .. 459
Mr. Victor Cavendish .. 459
Major Evans Gordon .. 460

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Original Question again proposed.

Captain Norton .. 460

Motion made, and Question put, " That Item B, 1 (Port Establishment, Salaries and Allowances) be reduced by £200."—(*Captain Norton.*)

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 55 ; Noes, 132. (Division List No. 129.)

Original Question again proposed.

Mr. Lough (Islington, W.) .. 463
Mr. Louis Sinclair (Essex, Romford) .. 465
Mr. Victor Cavendish .. 466
Mr. Whitley .. 466

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That Item B, 1 (Port Establishment, Salaries and Allowances) be reduced by £1,500."—(*Mr. Whitley.*)

Mr. Victor Cavendish .. 467
Mr. Dalziel (Kirkcaldy Burghs) .. 467
Mr. Gibson Bowles .. 468
Mr. Lough .. 469
Mr. Whitley .. 469
Sir Edward Grey (Northumberland, Berwick) .. 470
Mr. Victor Cavendish .. 470
Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty) .. 471
Lord Edmund Fitzmaurice (Wiltshire, Cricklade) .. 471
Sir John Gorst (Cambridge University) .. 472

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Original Question again proposed.

Mr. J. H. Lewis 472
Mr. Weir 473

Question put, and agreed to.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £1,355,000 be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Inland Revenue Department."

Mr. George Whiteley (*Yorkshire, W.R., Pudsey*) 473

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Item A (Salaries, Wages, and Allowances) be reduced by £100."—(*Mr. George Whiteley*).

The Chancellor of the Exchequer (*Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.*) 476
Mr. George Whiteley 476
Mr. Wallace (*Perth*) 477
Mr. Gibson Bowles 477
Sir Edward Strachey (*Somersetshire, S.*) 478
Mr. Austen Chamberlain 479

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Original Question again proposed.

Mr. Claude Hay 479

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Item A (Salaries, Wages, and Allowances) be reduced by £200."—(*Mr. Claude Hay*).

Mr. Weir 481
Mr. Gibson Bowles 482
Mr. Victor Cavendish 484
Mr. J. H. Lewis 485
Mr. Ainsworth (*Argyll*) 486
Mr. Claude Hay 486

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Original Question again proposed.

Mr. Weir 487

Original Question put, and agreed to.

June 1.] Page

CLASS I.

3. £435,300 to complete the sum for Revenue Buildings.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £290,900, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, in respect of sundry Public Buildings in Great Britain not provided for on other Votes."

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Resolutions to be reported To-morrow; Committee also report Progress; to sit again To-morrow.

ADJOURNMENT.—Motion made, and Question, "That this House do now adjourn."—(*Sir A. Acland-Hood*); put, and agreed to.

Adjourned at half after Seven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: WEDNESDAY, 1ST JUNE, 1904.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Chesterfield Corporation (Tramways and Improvements) Bill [LORDS].—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 489

London United Tramways Bill.—Middlesborough, Stockton-on-Tees, and Thornaby Tramways Bill. As amended, considered; to be read the third time 489

London County Council (Tramways and Improvements) Bill (BY ORDER)—Consideration, as amended, deferred till Thursday, 9th June (Evening Sitting) 489

NORTH BRITISH RAILWAY (GENERAL POWERS) ORDER CONFIRMATION.—Bill to confirm a Provisional Order, under The Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, relating to the North British Railway, ordered to be brought in by the Lord Advocate and Mr. A. Graham Murray.

North British Railway (General Powers) Order Confirmation Bill.—"To confirm a Provisional Order, under The Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, relating to the North British Railway," presented accordingly; and ordered to be considered upon Friday 489

LEITH CORPORATION TRAMWAYS ORDER CONFIRMATION.—Bill to confirm a Provisional Order, under the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, relating to Leith Corporation Tramways, ordered to be brought in by the Lord Advocate and Mr. A. Graham Murray.

June 1.] *Page*

Leith Corporation Tramways Order Confirmation Bill.—"To confirm a Provisional Order, under The Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland), Act, 1899, relating to Leith Corporation Tramways," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Thursday, 9th June, and to be printed. [Bill 209] 489

DUNDEE, BROUGHTY FERRY, AND DISTRICT TRAMWAYS ORDER CONFIRMATION.—Bill to confirm a Provisional Order, under The Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, relating to Dundee, Broughty Ferry, and District Tramways, ordered to be brought in by the Lord Advocate and Mr. A. Graham Murray.

Dundee, Broughty Ferry, and District Tramways Order Confirmation Bill.—"To confirm a Provisional Order, under The Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, relating to Dundee, Broughty Ferry, and District Tramways," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Thursday, 9th June, and to be printed. [Bill 216] 490

LEITH BURGH ORDER CONFIRMATION.—Bill to confirm a Provisional Order, under The Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, relating to the Burgh of Leith, ordered to be brought in by the Lord Advocate and Mr. A. Graham Murray.

Leith Burgh Order Confirmation Bill.—"To confirm a Provisional Order, under The Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, relating to the Burgh of Leith," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Thursday, 9th June, and to be printed. [Bill 217] 490

MOTHERWELL AND BELLSHILL RAILWAY (ABANDONMENT) ORDER CONFIRMATION.—Bill to confirm a Provisional Order, under The Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, relating to Motherwell and Bellshill Railway (Abandonment), ordered to be brought in by the Lord Advocate and Mr. A. Graham Murray.

Motherwell and Bellshill Railway (Abandonment) Order Confirmation Bill.—"To confirm a Provisional Order, under The Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, relating to Motherwell and Bellshill Railway (Abandonment)," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Thursday, 9th June, and to be printed. [Bill 218] .. 490

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petitions for alteration; from Forres; University of Edinburgh; and Lerwick; to lie upon the Table 491

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition from Campsie, in favour; to lie upon the Table 491

FRANCHISE AND REMOVAL OF WOMEN'S DISABILITIES (NO. 2) BILL.—Petition from Bermondsey, against; to lie upon the Table 491

HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES, ETC., BILL.—Petitions against; from Bradford; and Portsmouth; to lie upon the Table 491

June 1.] *Page*

Licensing Bill.—Petitions against: from Chesterfield; New Southgate; Ponder's End; Crawley; Vauxhall; Bristol (three); Durdham Down; Redland; Ellesmere; Pye Bank; Leeds (two); Dunoon; Sandbank; Winchmore Hill (four); Pentre; Carnoustie (two); Tollerton; Argyll; Stanton Prior; Chelsea; Cheddar (three); Wells; Ardrossan; Fairlie; Bridport (two); West Bristol (two); Edinburgh (two); Walkden and Little Hulton; Woodley; South and East Lancashire; Plasmere; Swindon; Neath; Brynhyfryd; Loughor; Stoke Newington; Alvaston; Birstall (three); Howden Clough; Marple; Bishopston (two); Gomersal; Perth (two); St. Lawrence; Aberdeen; Bonnybrigg; Bridge of Allan; Limerigg; Stirlingshire; Shipley (two); Wibsey; Leven (two); Thurso; Largs; Ashby de la Zouch; Heckmondwike; Slamannan; Harrington; Portesham; Ledbury; Catrin; Girvan; Annbank; Benquhat; Fortrose; Wigan; South West Lancashire; Northampton; New Trimdon; Hexham; Aston; Paisley; Renfrew (two); Port Glasgow; Dumbarton; Howard Park; Kilmarnock; Skelmanthorpe; Edzell; Brixton; Sileby; Leigh; Shiregreen; North Finchley; Stepney; Gloucester; East London; Bush Hill Park; West Hartlepool; Hanham; Birkenshaw (two); Rawtenstall (two); Bacup; Clowbridge; Dundee; Derby; Leyton (two); Inverness; Forest Hill; Walthamstow (two); New Malden (two); Farnworth; Walkden; Bury (nineteen); Elton; Holywell; Top-y-Rhos; Woolfold; Leuchars; Ladybank; Letham; Glossop; Worcester; Lewisham; Lamberhead Green; Salford; Stockport; Oldham (two); Royton (two); Holm East; Longhope; Stennes; Barnoldswick; Evesham; Westcliffe-on-Sea; Rayleigh; Southend-on-Sea; Bewdley; Lower Broughton; Canning Town (two); Newburn-on-Tyne; Maescar; Ystradgynlais (two); Mynydd Troedd; Sunnybridge; Rishton; Bala (two); Dolgelly; Llanfachreth; Corris; Slingsby; North Walbottle; Benwell (five); Wallsend; Sileby; Leicestershire; Stockport; Littleton; Oxfordshire; Newcastle-upon-Tyne; Scotswood-on-Tyne; Willington Quay; Cottenham; Llandeiful; Corwen; Brithdir; Twrog; Sansome Walk; Cannock; Ibstock (two); Portwood; Burghead; Odiham; Ellenabeich; Basingstoke (two); Tavistock; Hertfordshire; London; Evesham; Merioneth; St. Leonards (two); Bexhill (three); Putney; Dartford; Smallbridge; and Rochdale; to lie upon the Table 491

Licensing Bill.—Petitions for alteration; from Grangemouth; and Worcester; to lie upon the Table 491

Local Authorities (Qualification of Women) Bill.—Petition from Bermondsey against; to lie upon the Table 492

Re-vaccination Bill.—Petition from Stepney, against; to lie upon the Table 492

Tuberculosis (Animals) Compensation Bill.—Petition from Aberdeen, against; to lie upon the Table 492

Valuation Bill.—Petitions against; from Brecknock; King's Lynn; and Rotherham; to lie upon the Table 492

Valuation Bill.—Petitions for alteration; from Headington; Haslingden; Hexham; Tynemouth; Settle; Bealy; Loughborough; and Great Yarmouth; to lie upon the Table 493

Voluntary Schools Act, 1897.—Petition from Leeds, for alteration of Law; to lie upon the Table 493

June 1.] *Page*

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

LABOURERS' COTTAGES (IRELAND).—Return [presented 31st May] to be printed. [No. 188.] 493

POLLING DISTRICTS (COUNTY OF WARWICK).—Copy presented, of Order made by the County Council of the county of Warwick altering certain Polling Districts in the County [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 493

INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION (IRELAND).—Copy presented, of Report of the Intermediate Education Board for Ireland, for the year 1903 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 493

ARMY (MEDICAL DEPARTMENT).—Copy presented, of Report for the year 1902 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 493

NATIONAL SCHOOL TEACHERS' (IRELAND) PENSION FUND.—Annual Accounts presented, of Receipts and Payments for the year ended 31st December, 1903 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 493

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND).—Copy presented, of Thirty-first Annual Report by the Accountant for Scotland to the Scotch Education Department [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 493

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (NO. 7) BILL.—Return presented relative thereto [ordered 19th May; *Mr. Bonar Law*]; to lie upon the Table and to be printed. [No. 189.] 493

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (NO. 8) BILL.—Return presented relative thereto [ordered 19th May; *Mr. Bonar Law*]; to lie upon the Table and to be printed. [No. 190.] 494

SUGAR CONVENTION (COMMERCIAL, NO. 5, 1904).—Copy presented, of further Findings of the Permanent Commission established under Article VII. of the Sugar Convention of 5th March, 1902, and further Reports of the British Delegate [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 494

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).—Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, No. 3176 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 494

TRADE REPORTS (MISCELLANEOUS SERIES).—Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Miscellaneous Series, Nos. 610 and 611 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 494

LICENSING BILL.—Address for "Return showing separately as regards (1) Publicans' Licences, excluding Hotel Licences, (2) Beerhouse (including Beer and Wine) Licences, and (3) Hotel Licences, the number of Licences within each grade of the Schedule to the Licensing Bill of the present Session, and the maximum amount payable under the Bill in respect of the Licences within each grade in every county and county borough in England and Wales."—(*Mr. Cochrane.*) 494

June 1.] Page

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

INDEBTEDNESS OF BOROUGH COUNCILS.—Question, Mr. John Ellis (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 494

COMPULSORY RETIREMENT OF WAR OFFICE CLERKS.—Question, Sir Thomas Esmonde (Wexford, N.); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 495

PROPOSED VANDALISM AT BERWICK-ON-TWEED.—Question, Mr. Bryce (Aberdeen, S.); Answer, Lord Balcarres 496

BANK OF IRELAND—BALANCES UNDER THE LAND PURCHASE ACT, 1903.—Question, Mr. William Abraham (Cork County, N.E.); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 496

INCOME TAX IN RESPECT OF EMOLUMENTS OF SCHOOLMASTERS.—Question, Colonel Lockwood (Essex, Epping); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain .. 497

NAVAL EXPENDITURE OF FRANCE, GERMANY, AND RUSSIA.—Question, Mr. Runciman (Dewsbury); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 497

THE ARCHBISHOP OF CYPRUS.—Question, Mr. Yoxall (Nottingham, W.); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 497

THE FREE FOOD MOTION—FACILITIES FOR RESUMING DEBATE.—Question, Mr. Heywood Johnstone (Sussex, Horsham); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour .. 498

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

THE NEW ARMY SCHEME.—Question, Mr. Courtenay Warner (Staffordshire, Lichfield); Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Arnold-Forster, Belfast, W.) 498

Dean Forest Bill.—Ordered, That the Examiners of Petititons for Private Bills do examine the Dean Forest Bill with respect to compliance with the Standing Orders relative to Private Bills.—(*Mr. Victor Cavendish.*) 499

The Anglo-French Convention Bill—[SECOND READING.]—Order for the Second Reading read.

The Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (*Earl Percy, Kensington, S.*) 499

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Sir Edward Grey (*Northumberland, Berwick*) 516
Mr. Gibson Bowles (*Lynn Regis*) 524
Sir Charles Dilke (*Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean*) 536
Mr. Moon (*St. Pancras, N.*) 545
Mr. Robson (*South Shields*) 548
Mr. Joseph Walton (*Yorkshire, W.R., Barnsley*) 556

Sir Albert Rollit (*Islington, S.*) .. 561
Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (*Stirling Burghs*) .. 566
The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (*Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.*) .. 567
Mr. Emmott (*Oldham*) .. 575

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time and committed for To-morrow.

Shop Hours Bill.—[SECOND READING.]—Order for Second Reading read. Motion made, and Question proposed, " That the Bill be now read second time."

Sir Charles Dilke (*Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean*) .. 577
Captain Norton (*Newington, W.*) .. 578

Amendment proposed—

" To leave out from the word ' That ' to the end of the Question, in order to add the words ' in the opinion of this House, the proposed measure for the early closing of Shops is unduly hampered by restrictions, and, not providing for the regulation of the hours of shop assistants, fails to satisfy the terms of the unanimous Resolution of this House.' "—(*Sir Charles Dilke.*)

Question proposed, " That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Sir Frederick Banbury (*Camberwell, Peckham*) .. 579
Mr. Lawrence (*Liverpool, Abercromby*) .. 581
Mr. Thornton (*Clapham*) .. 582

And, it being half-past Seven of the clock, the debate stood adjourned to this Evening's Sitting.

EVENING SITTING.

Shop Hours Bill.—[SECOND READING.]—Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment to Question [1st June], " That the Bill be now read a second time."

Which Amendment was—

" To leave out from the word ' That ' to the end of the Question, in order to add the words ' in the opinion of this House, the proposed measure for the early closing of Shops is unduly hampered by restrictions, and, not providing for the regulation of the hours of shop assistants, fails to satisfy the terms of the unanimous Resolution of this House.' "—(*Sir Charles Dilke.*)

Question again proposed, " That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

June 1.] Page

Mr. Whitley (Halifax) 583
Mr. Herbert Robertson (Hackney, S.) 584
Mr. William Abraham (Glamorganshire, Rhondda) 586
Sir Francis Powell (Wigan) 588
Dr. Farquharson (Aberdeenshire, W.) 590
The Under Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Cochrane, Ayrshire, N.) 591
Sir Walter Foster (Derbyshire, Ilkeston) 596
Mr. Ernest Gray (West Ham, N.) 598
Mr. Theodore Taylor (Lancashire, Radcliffe) 599
Mr. Corbett (Glasgow, Tradeston) 601
Mr. J. A. Pease (Essex, Saffron Walden) 602
Dr. Macnamara (Camberwell, N.) 603
Mr. Shackleton (Lancashire, Clitheroe) 604

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 130 ; Noes, 42. (Division List, No. 130).

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That the Bill be committed to the Standing Committee on Trade, etc."—(*Mr. Cochrane.*)

Amendment proposed—

" To leave out the words ' Trade, etc.,' and insert the words ' Law, etc.'—(*Mr. Dalziel*)—instead thereof."

Question proposed, " That the words ' Trade, etc.' stand part of the Question."

The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Akers Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's) 680

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 129 ; Noes, 37. (Division List No. 131.)

Main Question put, and agreed to. Bill committed to the Standing Committee on Trade, etc.

Indian Councils Bill.—[SECOND READING.]—Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. Schwann (Manchester, W.) 609
The Secretary of State for India (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford) .. 609
Mr. Caldwell (Lanarkshire, Mid.) 610
Mr. Brodrick 611
Mr. Whitley (Halifax) 611
Mr. Courtenay Warner (Staffordshire, Lichfield) 612
Mr. Lough (Islington, W.) 612

And, it being Midnight, the debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed upon Friday.

NAVY (DESTROYERS).—Return ordered, "of the Destroyers built and launched since the 1st day of January, 1902, for His Majesty's Navy, in the following form :—

Names of Destroyers.	By whom built.	Speed obtained on full speed trials.	Consumption of coal per H.P. on the high speed consumption trials.	Average air pressure in the stokehole on the full speed trial.

—(*Mr. Kearley.*) 612

Adjourned at eight minutes after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: THURSDAY, 2ND JUNE, 1904.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH).—MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz. :—

Alexandra (Newport and South Wales) Docks and Railway Bill [Lords]; Barrow-in-Furness Corporation Bill [Lords]; Bristol Corporation Bill [Lords]; Bournemouth Corporation (Tramways) Bill [Lords]; Filey Improvement Bill [Lords]; Great Western Railway Bill [Lords]; Holywood Tramways Bill [Lords]; North Wales Electric Power Bill [Lords]; Portmadoc, Beddgelert, and South Snowdon Railway Bill [Lords]; Preston Corporation Water Bill [Lords]; St. Mary Woolnoth Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time 613

NAVAL WORKS (PORTSMOUTH BARRACKS SITE) BILL (STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE THERETO COMPLIED WITH).—MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, pursuant to the Order of the House of the 17th day of May, That, in the case of the following Bill, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz. :—

Naval Works (Portsmouth Barracks Site) Bill 613

June 2.] Page

Provisional Order Bills (Standing Orders Applicable thereto Complied with).—Mr. Speaker laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz. :—

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill; Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill.

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time To-morrow 613

Provisional Order Bills [Lords] (Standing Orders Applicable Thereto Complied with).—Mr. Speaker laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz. :—

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London) Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time To-morrow 614

Provisional Order Bills (No Standing Orders Applicable).—Mr. Speaker laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, referred on the First Reading thereof, no Standing Orders are applicable, viz. :—

Education Board Provisional Order (Swansea) Bill; Local Government Provisional Order (No. 15 Bill; Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill.

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time To-morrow 614

Chippenham Gas Bill.—Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to .. 614

Paisley District Tramways Order Confirmation Bill.—Read the third time, and passed 614

Saddleworth and Springhead Tramways (Abandonment) Bill.—Petition for additional Provision; referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills 614

Commons Regulation (Oxshott) Provisional Order Bill.—Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Order confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table; Bill to be read the third time To-morrow 614

Land Drainage Provisional Order (Owston and West Butterwick, in County of Lincoln) (Parts of Lindsey) Bill.—Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Order confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table. Bill to be read the third time To-morrow. 615

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill.—Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table. Bill to be read the third time To-morrow. 615

June 2.] *Page*

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill.—Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Orders confirmed] ; Report to lie upon the Table. Bill to be read the third time To-morrow. 615

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill.—Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Orders confirmed] ; Report to lie upon the Table. Bill to be read the third time To-morrow. 615

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 12) Bill.—Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Orders confirmed] ; Report to lie upon the Table. Bill to be read the third time To-morrow. 615

Local Government Provisional Orders (Gas) Bill.—Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Orders confirmed] ; Report to lie upon the Table. Bill to be read the third time To-morrow. 615

London County Council (Money) Bill ; New River Company Bill [Lords.]—Reported, with Amendments ; Reports to lie upon the Table 615

Chesterfield Gas and Water Board Bill [Lords.]—Reported, with Amendments ; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. 615

Commons Regulation (Merrow) Provisional Order Bill.—Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Order confirmed] ; Report to lie upon the Table. Bill to be read the third time To-morrow. 615

PETITIONS.

Education (Scotland) Bill.—Petitions for alteration ; ; from Linlithgow ; and Kingussie ; to lie upon the Table. 615

House-Letting (Scotland) Bill.—Petition from Falkirk, against ; to lie upon the Table. 615

Licensing Bill.—Petitions against : from Blythswood ; Falkirk (four) ; Gosport (two) ; Kelnley ; Halton Lea Gate ; St. John's Wood ; Deal (two) ; Halifax ; Maidenhead ; Islington ; Bromley Bywell ; Stockport (two) ; Liverpool ; Allendale ; Hareholm ; Newchurch in Rossendale ; Harper Towy ; Sarisbury Green ; Norland ; Pendleton (two) ; Twyford ; Sheepbridge ; Tilehurst ; Spencer's Wood ; Brimpton ; Reading ; Todmorden ; Sheffield ; Hamilton ; Cardiff (sixteen) ; Penarth ; Saffron Walden ; Snitterfield ; Tunstall (two) ; Chesterton ; Camborne ; Western Knowle ; Urmston ; Burghead (two) ; Stafford ; Hellah ; Aberfeldy ; Bracknell (two) ; Berks ; St. Helen's (five) ; Launceston ; Bathpool ; Lanhargy ; Coad's Green ; Lewannick ; Rilla Mill ; Hereford ; Padfield ; Solihull ; Tranent ; Three Mile Cross ; Essex ; Finglesham ; Tilmanstone ; Eastry ; Dore ; Bolton (three) ; Colwall ; Gateshead ; (two) ; Ascot ; Maidenhead (two) ; Brighton, Hove, and Haywards Heath ; Newton Abbot ; Torquay (five) ; Brixham ; Burslem ; North Staffordshire Pottery Towns ; Brighton ; Williton ; Watton at Stone ; Midgley ; Westmoreland ; Stockwell ; Wood Green ; Bollington ; Heanor ; Ilkestone ; Loscoe ; Mapperley ; Johnstone ; Newton Neath ; Adlington ; Brockley ; Monsall ; Manchester (two) ; Walmer ; Reading ; Gunnersbury ; Chesham ; Westmoor ; Whitefort ; Newcastle-on-Tyne ; Paignton ; Dronfield ; Stockton-on-Tees ; Cathays ; Batley ; East Linton ; Platt Bridge ; Newbury (two) ; Hebden Bridge ;

June 2.] *Page*

Southampton; Colcar; Buckhurst Hill; Denmead; Ashington; Hawick; Cheddington; Aberystwith; Worthing; Bridgwater (three); Ammanford; Broomfield; Wells-next the-Sea; Colne; Stopsley; Galashiels (three); Roxburgh; Llanelly (eight); Llwynhendy; National Unitarian Association Finsbury Park; Shepherd's Bush; Bedminster; Bristol (nine); Burry Port Kidwelly; Sandbach; Rhydlewis; Shoreham; Parkhead; Broadstone; Glasbury; Northwich; Davenham; Whitegate; Southport; Runcorn Heath; Brandon; Whitechurch; Upholland; Gorton; West Gorton; Ashton-under-Lyne; Burnley (four); Haslingden; Porthleven; Truro; Riddings; North East Lancashire; Upper Parkstone; Hull; Walkden; and Little Hulton; Gainsborough; Mount Sorrell; Longholmes; Edinburgh; Taibach; Swanage; Manselton; Loughor; Rochester; Plymouth; Chelmsford; East Hanningfield; Yorkshire; Clayton; Brentwood; Chignal; and Mashbury; Bloxwich; Brandon; and Kingswood; to lie upon the Table .. ..

LICENSING BILL.—Petitions for alteration; from Hawick; and Chelmsford; to lie upon the Table 617

LOCAL AUTHORITIES (TAXATION AND PURCHASE OF LAND) BILL.—Petition from St. Pancras, in favour; to lie upon the Table 617

METRIC WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.—Petition from Kidderminster, for legislation; to lie upon the Table —.. 617

RE-VACCINATION BILL.—Petition from Wandsworth, against; to lie upon the Table 617

RE-VACCINATION BILL.—Petition from Chester, in favour; to lie upon the Table 617

SHOP HOURS BILL.—Petition from Edinburgh, in favour; to lie upon the Table .. 617

TRADES UNIONS AND TRADE DISPUTES BILL.—Petition from Bristol against; to lie upon the Table 617

TUBERCULOSIS (ANIMALS) COMPENSATION BILL.—Petition from Huddersfield, against; to lie upon the Table 617

VALUATION BILL.—Petitions for alteration; from Auckland; Fareham; Atcham; Newent; Brackley; Northwich; and Strood; to lie upon the Table 617

VALUATION BILL.—Petition from Hackney, in favour; to lie upon the Table .. 617

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

MINES AND QUARRIES.—Copy presented; of General Report and Statistics for the year 1903, Part I. (District Statistics) Statistics of the Persons employed, Output, and Accidents at Mines and Quarries in the United Kingdom, arranged according to the Inspection districts [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 618

June 2.] *Page*

EXPLOSIVES.—Copy presented; of Twenty-eighth Annual Report of his Majesty's Inspectors of Explosives, being for the year 1903 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 618

Licensing Bill.—Return presented; relative thereto [Address 1st June; *Mr. Cochrane*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 191].. .. 618

COLONIAL REPORTS (ANNUAL).—Copy presented; of Colonial Report, No. 416 (Leeward Islands), Annual Report for 1902-3 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 618

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

THE NEW RIVER COMPANY AND THE LONDON WATER ACT.—Question, Colonel Bowles (Middlesex, Enfield); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 618

TELEGRAPHIST DUTIES IN ARMAGH POST OFFICE.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale (Armagh, Mid); Answer, Lord Stanley 619

DRAFT SCHEME FOR WHITSTABLE CHARITIES.—Question, Mr. Slack (Hertfordshire, St. Albans); Answer, Sir William Anson 619

HOSTILITIES IN THE COUNTRY BETWEEN THE NIGER CROSS RIVERS.—Question, T. W. Russell (Tyrone, S.); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 619

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

CONSCRIPTION—DECISION OF THE GOVERNMENT.—Questions, Mr. Herbert Samuel (Yorkshire, Cleveland), and Mr. C. R. Spencer (Northamptonshire, Mid); Answers, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Arnold-Forster, Belfast, W.) 620

3RD NORTH STAFFORDSHIRE REGIMENT—WILLIAM VERNON'S CASE.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 621

CANADA AND IMPERIAL DEFENCE.—Question, Mr. Charles Devlin (Galway); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Lyttelton, Warwick and Leamington) 622

IMPERIAL COUNCIL OF DEFENCE.—Question, Mr. Charles Devlin; Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 622

NAVAL MINES.—Question, Mr. John Campbell (Armagh, S.); Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Earl Percy, Kensington, S.) 623

THE POST OFFICE WAGES COMMITTEE.—Questions, Sir James Woodhouse (Huddersfield), and Mr. Bayley (Derbyshire, Chesterfield); Answers, The Postmaster-General (Lord Stanley, Lancashire, Westhoughton) 623

VACCINATION NOTICES.—Questions, Mr. Weir and Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis); Answers, The Secretary to the Local Government Board (Mr. Grant Lawson, Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk) 624

EJECTMENTS ON EARL FITZWILLIAM'S ESTATE.—Questions, Mr. James O'Connor (Wicklow, W.), and Mr. T. W. Russell (Tyrone, S.); Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 624

Kilbride Camp Canteen Licences.—Question, Mr. James O'Connor; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 625

Ardglass Herring Fishery Inquiry.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh (Down, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 626

Establishment by Local Authorities of Motor Services in Ireland.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 626

Kilcoo Postal Arrangements.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh; Answer, Lord Stanley 627

Galway Docks.—Questions, Mr. Charles Devlin and Colonel Nolan (Galway, N.); Answers, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Victor Cavendish, Derbyshire, W.) 627

Dredger for Galway Harbour.—Question, Mr. Charles Devlin; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 628

Blocking Notices.—Questions, Mr. Malcolm (Suffolk, Stowmarket), Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs), and Mr. Gibson Bowles; Answers, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 628

The Aliens Bill.—Question, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 630

The Finance Bill.—Question, Mr. Lough (Islington, W.); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 631

Army Medical Vote.—Question, Dr. Farquharson (Aberdeenshire, W.); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 631

Anglo-French Convention (Expenses).—Committee to consider of authorising the payment, out of moneys provided by Parliament, of any sums payable by way of indemnity pursuant to any Act of the present session for approving and carrying into effect a Convention between His Majesty and the President of the French Republic, and any expenses to be incurred in carrying the said Convention into effect (King's Recommendation signified), to-morrow.—(*Sir A. Acland-Hood.*)

Aliens (Expenses).—Committee to consider of authorising the payment, out of moneys to be provided by Parliament, of the salaries and remuneration of any persons employed, and of any expenses incurred under any Act of the present session, to make provision with respect to the immigration of Aliens, and other matters incidental thereto (King's Recommendation signified), to-morrow.—(*Sir A. Acland-Hood.*)

NEW BILL.

Post Office Sites Bill.—"To enable His Majesty's Postmaster-General to acquire lands in London, Southgate, Blackpool, Leeds, and Newcastle-upon-Tyne for the public service; and for other purposes," presented by Lord Stanley; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 219.]

June 2.] *Page*

SUPPLY [11TH ALLOTTED] DAY.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1904–1905.—CLASS II. —Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £142 089, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905. for the salaries and Expenses of the Local Government Board."

Sir Edward Strachey (Somersetshire, S.) 632

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Item A (Salaries and Wages) be reduced by £100."—*(Sir Edward Strachey.)*

Mr. Cathcart (Orkney and Shetland) 635
Mr. Nussey (Pontefract) 636
The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Walter Long, Bristol, S.) 636
Mr. Henry Hobhouse (Somersetshire, E.) 638
Sir Carne Rasch (Essex, Chelmsford) 638

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Original Question again proposed.

Sir Ernest Flower (Bradford, W.) 638
Mr. Herbert Samuel (Yorkshire, Cleveland) 640
Sir John Gorst (Cambridge University) 641
Mr. Crooks (Woolwich) 648
Mr. Claude Hay (Shoreditch, Hoxton) 653
Mr. John Hutton (Yorkshire, Richmond) 650
Sir A. Hayter (Walsall) 656
Mr. T. W. Russell (Tyrone, S.) 657
Mr. Theodore Taylor (Lancashire, Radcliffe) 659
Mr. Toulmin (Bury, Lancashire) 661
Mr. Walter Long (Bristol, S.) 663
Mr. Kearley (Devonport) 669
The Secretary to the Local Government Board (Mr. Grant Lawson, Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk) 672
Mr. Alfred Davies (Carmarthen Boroughs) 674
Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty) 675

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum not exceeding £141,889 be granted for the said service."—*(Mr. Weir.)*

Mr. Walter Long 678
Mr. Weir 679

The Committee proceeded to a Division, and the Chariman stated that he thought the Noes had it; and, on his decision being challenged, it appeared to him that the Division was vexatiously claimed, and he accordingly called upon the Members who supported and who challenged his decision successively to rise in their places, and he declared the Noes had it, Fifteen Members only who challenged his decision having stood up.

Original Question again proposed.

And, it being after half-past Seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

Thames River Steamboat Service Bill (BY ORDER).—Order for Consideration, as amended, read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill, as amended, be now considered."

Mr. Ernest Gray (*West Ham, N.*) 680
Sir Frederick Banbury (*Camberwell, Peckham*) 686

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day six months.'"—(*Mr. Ernest Gray.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

Sir Joseph Leese (*Lancashire, Accrington*) 688
Sir Alexander Brown (*Shropshire, Wellington*) 691
Mr. John Burns (*Battersea*) 691
Mr. Platt-Higgins (*Salford, N.*) 696
Mr. Fitzroy (*Northamptonshire, S.*) 697
Mr. Charles Hobhouse (*Bristol, E.*) 700
Lord Hugh Cecil (*Greenwich*) 700
Captain Jessel (*St. Pancras, S.*) 701
Mr. Cumming Macdona (*Southwark, Rotherhithe*) 702

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 156; Noes, 70. (Division List No. 132.)

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill, as amended, considered.

A Clause (Purchase of piers and steamboats from the Thames Steamboat Company (1897)—

"The Council shall, before exercising any of the powers of this Act, purchase such of the piers and such of the steamboats of the Thames Steamboat Company (1897), Limited, for such a price and upon such terms and conditions as, failing agreement, shall be determined by an arbitrator to be appointed by the Board of Trade, and in

such arbitration the price to be paid shall be the value (exclusive of any allowance for past or future profits of the undertaking or any compensation for compulsory sale or other consideration whatsoever) of such steamboats, piers, landing-places, and other property of the Steamboat Company suitable to and heretofore used by them for the purpose of a steamboat service on the Thames."—(*Mr. Ernest Gray.*)

Brought up, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question, "That the Clause be read a second time," put, and negatived.

Bill to be read the third time.

SUPPLY [11TH ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1904-5.—CLASS II.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £146,461, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Office of the Committee of Privy Council for Trade and Subordinate Departments, including a Grant in Aid."

Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty) 710

And, it being Midnight, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon Monday next.

Adjourned at five minutes after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: FRIDAY, 3RD JUNE, 1904.

The House met at Twelve of the Clock.

MONUMENT TO THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY.—The Comptroller of the Household reported His Majesty's Answer to the Address 713

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH),—Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz.:—

Ticehurst and District Water and Gas Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time 713

June 3.] *Page*

Carlisle Corporation Bill.—Read the third time, and passed 713

Lytham Improvement Bill.—Read the third time, and passed. [New Title] 713

Radcliffe Tramways and Improvement Bill.—Read the third time, and passed 713

Commons Regulation (Merrow) Provisional Order Bill; Commons Regulation (Oxshott) Provisional Order Bill; Land Drainage Provisional Order (Owston and West Butterwick), in County of Lincoln (Parts of Lindsey) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (Gas) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 12) Bill.—Read the third time, and passed 713

North British Railway (General Powers) Order Confirmation Bill.—Considered, to be read the third time upon Monday next 714

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London) Bill [LORDS]; Education Board Provisional Order (Swansea) Bill; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 8 Bill); Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill; Local Government Provisional Order (No. 15) Bill.—Read a second time, and committed 714

Railway Bills (Group No. 9).—Ordered, That Robert Casson, J. G. Morpeth, and J. McKay do attend the Committee on Group No. 9 of Railway Bills on Tuesday next, at half-past Eleven of the clock 714

Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 1) Bill [LORDS].—Copy ordered, "of Memorandum stating the nature of the Proposals contained in the Provisional Order included in the Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 1) Bill [Lords]."—(*Mr. Bonar Law*).

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill.—Copy ordered, "of Memorandum stating the nature of the Proposals contained in the Provisional Orders included in the Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill."—(*Mr. Bonar Law*) 714

PETITIONS.

COLLEGIATE CHARGES (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition from Haddington, in favour; to lie upon the Table 715

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petitions for alteration; from Biggar; Haddington; and Dunoon and Kilmuir; to lie upon the Table 715

LANDS VALUATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition from Haddington, against; to lie upon the Table 715

LAND VALUES TAXATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition from Haddington, against; to lie upon the Table 715

Licensing Bill.—Petitions against; from Kidderminster; Morpeth; Blyth; Bristol (twelve); Newchapel; Chell; Kirklington; New Southgate; Bedminster (two); Brislington; Chalford; Brown Knowle; Helsby; Sowerby Bridge; Cambois; Sheffield (five); Merthyr; Worthing; Armley (two); Rothwell; Macclesfield; Brighton; Wood Green; Clayton; Moston; Failsworth (two); Midyell; Uyeasound; Burray; Lerwick; Mountain Ash (two); Barton Hill; Hyde; Brixton Hill; Liverpool (four); Pelynt; Harrow; Edinburgh (two); Bridgwater; Leigh; Bannockburn; Oswestry (two); Wetham; Scarborough; Braintree and Bocking; Newcastle-on-Tyne (eight); Tinsbury; Kensal Rise; Carluke; Bradworthy; Plymouth; Cilfowys; Gorebridge; Southall (two); Birmingham; Appley Bridge; Glassford; Nethan Vale; Aspull (two); Stenton; Mossley; Norton Backmoor; Coal Aston; Norton Woodseats; Newtown; Deptford and Brockley; Budleigh Salterton; Wibsey; Moseley; Oldham (two); Portmadoc; Leytonstone; Kilkhampton; Woodford Morwenstone; Woolley Morwenstone; Poughill; Feltham; Kilkhampton; Stratton; Hanwell; Morrilow Heath; Horth Brierley; Bude; Walthamstow (two); Tower Hamlets; Low Moor; Burton-on-Trent; Deddington; Preston Brook; Lostock; Tulse Hill and West Norwood; Wigan (two); Watford; Birstall (three); Bourton-on-the-Water; Henley; Gosforth; Fortress; Ardersier; Emley; Coneysthorpe; Sarisbury; Watchet; Newton-on-Ouse; Inverness; Denbigh; Colne; Trawden; West Bromwich (two); Kingston-on-Thames (four); New Seaham; Totterdown; Ronsay; Stane; Maesteg; Glyncorrwg; Middleton on the Wolds; Bridlington Quay (two); Tiverton; Langley Mill; Manchester (two); Cameley; Sutcombe; Ryecroft; Blackley; Willington Quay; and St. Budeaux; to lie upon the Table 715

Licensing Bill.—Petition from Worcester, for alteration; to lie upon the Table 716

Local Government (Scotland) Act (1894) Amendment Bill.—Petition from Haddington, in favour; to lie upon the Table 716

Re-Vaccination Bill.—Petition from St. Pancras, against; to lie upon the Table 716

Re-Vaccination Bill.—Petition from Bootle, in favour; to lie upon the Table 716

Teinds (Scotland) Bill.—Petition from Haddington, in favour; to lie upon the Table 716

Town and County Councils (Qualification of Women) Scotland) Bill.—Petition from Haddington, against; to lie upon the Table 716

Valuation Bill.—Petition from Merthyr Tydfil, against; to lie upon the Table 716

Valuation Bill.—Petitions for alteration; from City of London; Chipping Sodbury; Ulveston; and Bristol; to lie upon the Table 716

Workmen's Compensation Bill.—Petition from Bristol, against; to lie upon the Table 716

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Sinking Funds.—Account presented, of the Commissioners for the reduction of the National Debt, showing the amount received and applied in the year ended 13st March 1904, in respect of the Old and New Sinking Funds [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 192] 717

June 3.] *Page*

EAST INDIA (FINANCIAL STATEMENT).—Return presented, relative thereto [Address 19th May; *Sir Henry Fowler*] to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 193] 717

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

VACANCIES AMONG FEMALE TELEGRAPHISTS IN IRELAND.—Question, Mr. Macveagh (Down, S.); Answer, Lord Stanley 717

DELAY IN TRANSMISSION OF MAILS FROM THE WEST OF IRELAND TO BELFAST.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell (Longford, N.); Answer, Lord Stanley 717

NATURAL FERTILISERS AND COTTON GROWING IN INDIA.—Question, Mr. Emmott (Oldham); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 718

MEMORIAL OF VETERINARY OFFICERS OF IRISH DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 718

ASSISTANTS IN IRISH NATIONAL SCHOOLS.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 718

APPOINTMENT OF IRISH NATIONAL TEACHERS AS SECRETARIES OF SCHOOL ATTENDANCE COMMITTEES.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 719

LOCH LEVEN TROUT FOR THE UPPER BANN RIVER.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 719

ADVANCES IN AID OF IRISH INDUSTRIES.—Question, Mr. Brigg (Yorkshire, W.R., Keighley); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 917

ANGLO-FRENCH AGREEMENT—POSITION OF NEWFOUNDLAND.—Question, Mr. Runciman (Dewsbury); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 720

Post Office Sites Bill.—Ordered, That the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills do examine the Post Office Sites Bill with respect to compliance with the Standing Orders relative to Private Bills.—(*Lord Stanley*) 721

Housing of the Working Classes (Rural Districts) Bill.—Second Reading deferred from Monday next till Wednesday next 721

A QUESTION OF ORDER.—Questions, Mr. Cullinan (Tipperary, S.) and Mr. Whitley (Halifax); Answers, Mr. Speaker 721

Penal Servitude Bill—[SECOND READING].—Order for Second Reading read.

The Secretary of State for the Home Department (*Mr. Akers-Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's*) 722

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. Caldwell (*Lanarkshire, Mid.*) 728
Mr. H. D. Greene (*Shrewsbury*) 732
Sir Joseph Leese (*Lancashire, Accrington*) 738
Sir Howard Vincent (*Sheffield, Central*) 740

June 3.]

Page
Mr. Toulmin (Bury, Lancashire) .. 741
Sir Ernest Flower (Bradford, W.) .. 743
Mr. Brigg (Yorkshire, W.R., Keighley) .. 744
Mr. Trevelyan (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland) .. 745
Mr. Whitley (Halifax) .. 747
Colonel Sandys (Lancashire, Bootle) .. 748
Mr. Haldane (Haddingtonshire) .. 749
Mr. Runciman (Dewsbury) .. 752
The Under-Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Cochrane, Ayrshire) .. 755
Mr. Dalziel (Kirkcaldy Burghs) .. 757
Mr. Hemphill (Tyrone, N.) .. 760
Mr. Crooks (Woolwich) .. 765
Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty) .. 787
Mr. Slack (Hertfordshire, St. Albans) .. 768

Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The House divided :—Ayes, 181 ; Noes, 71. (Division List No. 133).

Question put accordingly, and agreed to. Bill read a second time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be committed to the Standing Committee on Law, etc."—*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*

And it being after half-past Five of the Clock, and objection being taken to Further Proceeding, the debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed upon Monday next.

Outdoor Relief (Friendly Societies) (No. 3) Bill.

Sir Edward Strachey (Somersetshire, S.) .. 771

Motion made, and Question, "That the Order for the Second Reading of this Bill be discharged, and the Bill withdrawn," put and agreed to.

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

INDIAN ARMY (MEMORANDUM).

Order [19th May] for an Address for a Return relative thereto read, and discharged ; and, instead thereof—

Indian Army (Memorandum) Address for "Return of the Memorandum recently issued by General Lord Kitchener of Khartoum and the Local Commander-in-Chief in India upon the organisation and training of the Army in India."—(*Sir Howard Vincent*) .. 772

Adjourned at twelve minutes before Six o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: MONDAY, 6TH JUNE, 1904.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Private Bills (Petition for Additional Provision) (Standing Orders not Complied with).—Mr. Speaker laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the Petition for additional provision in the following Bill, the Standing Orders have not been complied with, viz.:—Saddleworth and Springhead Tramways (Abandonment) Bill. Ordered, That the Report be referred to the Select Committee on Standing Orders 773

Dean Forest Bill (Standing Orders Applicable Thereto Complied with).—Mr. Speaker laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, referred pursuant to the Order of the House of the 1st day of June, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz.:—Dean Forest Bill 773

London United Tramways Bill (King's Consent signified).—Bill read the third time, and passed. [New Title.] 773

Middlesborough, Stockton-on-Tees, and Thornaby Tramways Bill (King's Consent signified).—Bill read the third time, and passed 773

Thames River Steamboat Service Bill (King's Consent and Prince of Wales' Consent signified).—Bill read the third time, and passed .. 773

North-Western Electricity and Power Gas Bill; Skipton Water and Improvement Bill. As amended, considered; to be read the third time .. 773

North British Railway (General Powers) Order Confirmation Bill.—Read the third time, and passed 773

PETITIONS.

Education (Scotland) Bill.—Petitions for alteration; from Jura; and Forres; to lie upon the Table 774

Housing of the Working Classes, Etc., Bill.—Petition from Portsmouth, against; to lie upon the Table 774

Licensing Bill.—Petitions against; from Hindley; Kingsley; Bristol; Southampton; Westminster; Dunfermline; Greenlaw; Pontardulais; Llandilo; Plymouth; Frodsham; Alva; Chester; Stafford; Crouch Hill; Pembroke; Oldfield; Brighouse; Streatham; Elland; Sheffield; Swansea Valley; Langhor; Forest Fach; Pontardawe; Porteynon; Dorking (two); Reigate; Red Hill; Manchester and Salford; Islington; Allendale; Lower Bantham; Balscote; Horley; Watford (four); Rickmansworth; High Bentham; Battersea; Portsmouth (six); Langton Matravers; Gainsborough; Walsall; Aston; Keasden; Warmwell Heath; Osmington; Chickerell; Wyke Regis; Westham; Weymouth (two); Upwey; Broadway; Preston; Winfrith; Miles Platting; Reynoldstone; Oxwich; Pitton Gower; Llangennith; Horton; South

Norwood; Cardiff (three),; Felling (two); Venerable Bede; Bill Quay; Armadale; Manchester; Croydon (two); Abingdon; Cefn Crib; Stockport (five); Newmilns; Ayr; West London; Woodside; Fortune's Well; South Stockport; South Watford; Easton (two); Ince in Makerfield; Settle; Bentham; Peterborough (three); Haddenham; Northampton; Bolton; Neithrop; Wincanton; South Cheriton; Hemel Hempstead; Burton-in-Lonsdale; Haslingden; Lochwinnoch; Kingsthorpe; North West London; Neilston; Fortrose; Newcastle-on-Tyne; Rossendale; Cloughfold; Bacup; York; Calverley; Falmouth (two); Newby; Kingston; Pontnewynydd; Bretherton; Hamworthy; Newtown; Higher Lytchett; Nuneaton; Dunkswell; Fauldhouse (two); Banbury; Aston-under-Lyne; Abergavenny (two); Finstown; Brixton; Ryecroft; Cullingworth; East Morton; Leamington (two); Warwick; Auchterarder; Burrelton Nottinghamshire; Keyworth; Rock Ferry; Batley; Keighley; Wallingford; Herston; South Wales and Monmouthshire; Southsea (two); Wolverhampton (two); Heronsgate; Pinner; Batley; Sturminster; Worth Matravers; Wareham; Parkstone; Morden; Kenson; Waterloo; Lower Lychett; Binegar; Easkote; Shutford; Birkenhead (four); Mount Tabor; Bonsall; Cupar Angus; Methven; Nuneaton; Diss; Corfe Castle; Northampton; and Swindon; to lie upon the Table .. 774

LICENSING BILL.—Petitions for alteration; from Ramsbury; and Bridgwater; to lie upon the Table 775

PARLIAMENTARY FRANCHISE.—Petition from Warwick, for extension to women; to lie upon the Table 775

RATING OF MACHINERY BILL.—Petition from Sheffield, against; to lie upon the Table 775

SINGH, MAHENDRA MAHARAJAH MADHAVA.—Petition of Mahendra Maharajah Madhava Singh, for redress of grievances; to lie upon the Table 775

VALUATION BILL.—Petitions for alteration; from Croydon; St. Marylebone; and Bridgwater; to lie upon the Table 775

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

AGRICULTURE AND TECHNICAL INSTRUCTION (IRELAND) ACT, 1899.—Copy presented, of Three Minutes by the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction for Ireland sanctioning forms of Instruction for the county borough of Cork and the urban district of Athlone [by Act]; to lie upon the Table .. 775

WEST AFRICA.—Copy presented, of Statement of the Revenue and Expenditure and the Trade of the Gambia, Sierra Leone, and the Gold Coast, from the year 1985, and of Lagos and Southern and Northern Nigeria from the year 1900 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 775

CROWN AGENTS.—Return presented, relative thereto [Address 17th May; *Mr. Herbert Samuel*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 194.] .. 776

LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL.—Copy presented, of Returns relating to the Council up to 31st March, 1904, with Estimate of Expenditure for the year ending 31st March, 1905 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 195] 776

June 6.] Page

EXPLOSIONS (MESSRS. CURTIS AND HARVEY'S FACTORY AT CLIFFE, KENT).—Copy presented, of Report by Major A. Cooper-Key, His Majesty's Inspector of Explosives, to the Secretary of State for the Home Department, on the circumstances attending an Explosion of Nitro-glycerine in the separating house of the Factory of Messrs. Curtis and Harvey, Limited, at Cliffe, Kent, on the 18th February, 1904 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 776

POLLING DISTRICTS (COUNTY OF STAFFORD).—Copy presented, of Order made by the County Council of the County of Stafford altering certain Polling Districts in the Handsworth Parliamentary Division [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 776

POLLING DISTRICTS (WEST RIDING OF THE COUNTY OF YORK).—Copy presented, of Order made by the County Council of the West Riding of the County of York altering certain Polling Districts in the Hallamshire Parliamentary Division [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 776

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).—Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3177 to 3179 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 776

Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 1) Bill [LORDS].—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 3rd June; *Mr. Bonar Law*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 196] 776

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill.—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 3rd June; *Mr. Bonar Law*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 197] 777

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.—Public Records (Home Office). Copy of Schedule containing a List and Particulars of Classes of Documents which were returned to the Office of His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Home Department, and which are now in the Public Record Office, but which are not considered of sufficient public value to justify their preservation therein [by Act] 777

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

ANNOYANCE CAUSED BY HEAVY GUN FIRING OFF TORBAY.—Question, Mr. John Kennaway (Devonshire, Honiton); Answer, Mr. Pretyman 777

DELAY IN ERECTION OF COASTGUARD STATION AT ARRYHEERA, COUNTY DONEGAL —Question, Mr O'Doherty (Donegal, N.); Answer, Mr Pretyman .. 777

PROMOTIONS OF SENIOR ASSISTANT CLERKS.—Question, Mr. Yoxall (Nottingham, W.); Answer, Mr. Victor Cavendish 778

MAIL RELIEFS IN LIVERPOOL POST OFFICE.—Question, Mr. Shackleton (Lancashire, Clitheroe); Answer, Lord Stanley 779

APPOINTMENT OF MALE TELEGRAPH LEARNERS IN LIVERPOOL POST OFFICE.—Question, Mr. Shackleton; Answer, Lord Stanley 779

POSTAL DUTIES FOR OXFORD TELEGRAPH STAFF.—Question, Mr. William Jones (Carnarvonshire, Arfon); Answer, Lord Stanley 780

June 6.]

Page

TELEPHONIC COMMUNICATION WITH TIPPERARY, CLONMEL, AND CAHIR.—Question, Mr. Cullinan (Tipperary, S.); Answer, Lord Stanley 781

PAY AND PROMOTION OF LONDON SORTER TRACERS.—Question, Mr. Kimber (Wandsworth); Answer, Lord Stanley 781

CONDITION OF OAK TREES IN RICHMOND PARK.—Question, Mr. John Hutton (Yorkshire, Richmond); Answer, Lord Balcarres 781

PUPIL TEACHERS.—Question, Mr. Henry Hobhouse (Somersetshire, E.); Answer, Sir William Anson 782

LEITH AND EDINBURGH EDUCATION AREA.—Question, Mr. Munro Ferguson (Leith Burghs); Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 782

IMPROVED ACCOMMODATION AND PRECAUTIONS AGAINST FIRE FOR SICK POOR IN WORKHOUSES.—Question, Mr. Munro Ferguson; Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 783

SALE OF ESTATES IN COUNTY DONEGAL.—Question, Mr. O'Doherty; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 783

STANDARD NUMBERS FOR DIFFERENT GRADES OF IRISH TEACHERS.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh (Down, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 784

SALARIES OF IRISH NATIONAL SCHOOL TEACHERS.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh, Answer, Mr. Wyndham 784

POLICE METHODS IN IRELAND.—Question, Mr. Cullinan; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 785

IRISH LAND PURCHASE—RE-INSTATEMENT OF EVICTED TENANTS.—Question, Mr. Cullinan; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 785

NURSES FOR MILITARY STATIONS.—Question, Sir John Colomb (Great Yarmouth); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 786

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

ADMIRALTY PENSIONS.—Question, Sir Carne Rasch (Essex, Chelmsford); Answer, The Civil Lord of the Admiralty (Mr. Arthur Lee, Hampshire, Fareham) 787

THE KING'S UNIFORM IN PUBLIC PLACES OF ENTERTAINMENT.—Questions, Sir Carne Rasch, General Laurie (Pembroke and Haverfordwest), Mr. MacVeagh (Down, S.) and Mr. Cullinan (Tipperary, S.); Answers, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Arnold-Forster, Belfast, W.) 787

ANTI-TYPHOID INOCULATIONS.—Questions, Mr. Eugene Wason (Clackmannan and Kinross); Answers, Mr. Arnold-Forster 788

ARMY CORPS.—Questions, Colonel Nolan (Galway, N.), and Mr. Charles Hobhouse (Bristol, E.); Answers, Mr. Arnold-Forster 789

VOLUNTEERS—COST OF TRAINING.—Questions, Mr. Lambert (Devonshire, South Molton); Answers, Mr. Arnold-Forster 789

SHAMBLES BARRACKS, GALWAY.—Questions, Mr. Charles Devlin (Galway); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 790

June 6.]

Page

Commissioners of Mines and Railways in the Transvaal.—Question, Mr. John Ellis (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Lyttelton, Warwick and Leamington) 790

Selukwe Gold Mines—Natives Mortality.—Questions, Mr. Herbert Samuel (Yorkshire, Cleveland) and Mr. Trevelyan (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland); Answers, Mr. Lyttelton 791

Native Labour in the Transvaal.—Question, Sir John Gorst (Cambridge University); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 791

Chinese Labour in Southern Rhodesia.—Questions, Mr. Herbert Samuel, Mr. Trevelyan, Mr. Markham (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield) and Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs); Answers, Mr. Lyttelton and the Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 791

The Mission to Tibet.—Question, Mr. Lambert; Answer, The Secretary of State for India (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford) 793

Competition for Government Appointments in India.—Question, Colonel Nolan; Answer, Mr. Brodrick 794

Massacres in the Sasun District.—Questions, Mr. Bryce (Aberdeen, S.); Answers, The Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Earl Percy, Kensington, S.) 795

Employment of Children Act By-Laws.—Question, Mr. Tennant (Berwickshire); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Akers-Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine) 796

The Post Office and National Telephone Company.—Question, Mr. Lough (Islington, W.); Answer, The Postmaster-General (Lord Stanley, Lancashire, Westhoughton) 796

Cycle Allowance to Telegraph linemen.—Question, Captain Norton (Newington, W.); Answer, Lord Stanley 797

Books of Postage Stamps.—Question, Mr. Eugene Wason; Answer, Lord Stanley 797

Canadian Duty on Woollen Goods.—Question, Mr. D. A. Thomas (Merthyr Tydvil); Answer, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Gerald Balfour, Leeds, Central) 798

Report of Committee on Duties of Board of Trade and Local Government Board.—Question, Mr. D. A. Thomas; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.) 798

New Education Code—Changed System of Grants.—Questions, Sir John Dorington (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury) and Sir Edward Strachey (Somersetshire, S.); Answers, The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education (Sir William Anson, Oxford University) 798

Pauper Children and Pauper Nursing in Scotland.—Questions, Mr. Tennant and Mr. Cathcart Wason (Orkney and Shetland); Answers, The Lord Advocate (Mr. Scott Dickson, Glasgow, Bridgton) 800

June 6.] **Page**

LORD LONGFORD'S WESTMEATH ESTATE.—Question, Mr. Sullivan (Westmeath, S.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) .. 801

LAND PURCHASE IN COUNTY DOWN.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh; Answer, Mr Wyndham 801

KILBRIDE CAMP CANTEEN.—Questions, Mr. James O'Connor (Wicklow, W.); and Mr. Cullinan; Answers, Mr. Wyndham 802

EARL FITZWILLIAM AND HIS TENANTS.—Questions, Mr. James O'Connor; Answers, Mr. Wyndham 803

WORKS IN GALWAY MILL STREET.—Question, Mr. Charles Devlin; Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Victor Cavendish, Derbyshire, W.) 803

GALWAY DRAINAGE.—Question, Colonel Nolan; Answer, Mr. Victor Cavendish 803

INTERNATIONAL LAW OF WARFARE.—Question, Mr. Lawson Walton (Leeds, S.), Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 804

CONSCRIPTION.—Question, Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield, Central); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 804

STATE REGISTRATION OF NURSES.—Questions, Mr. Tennant; Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 805

DEFENCE OF THE UNITED KINGDOM.—Question, Mr. Lambert; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 805

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.—Question, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 806

MEMBERS AND THE CHAIRMAN.—Questions, Mr. Markham; Answers, Mr. Speaker 806

THE NEW EDUCATION CODE.—Question, Sir Edward Strachey; Answer, Mr Speaker 807

NEW WRIT.—New Writ for the county of Leicester (South or Harborough Division), in the room of John William Logan, Esquire (Manor of Northstead.—(*Mr. Robert Spencer.*) 807

NEW BILLS.

Shipowners' Negligence (Remedies) Bill.—"To enlarge the remedies of persons injured by the negligence of Shipowners." presented by Sir Harry Samuel; supported by Mr. Brynmor Jones, Sir Ernest Flower, Mr. Sydney Buxton, and Mr. Bell; to be read a second time upon Monday, 20th June, and to be printed. [Bill 220.] 808

County Courts (Admiralty Jurisdiction) Bill.—"To amend the County Courts (Admiralty Jurisdiction) Acts by giving powers of arrest of foreign ships in cases of personal injury to British workmen and others on board any such ship," presented by Sir Albert Rollit; supported by Sir James Woodhouse; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, and to be printed. [Bill 221.] 808

June 6.] Page

Municipal Franchise (Companies) Bill.—"To confer the Municipal Franchise upon mercantile corporations and companies," presented by Sir Albert Rollit; supported by Sir Fortesque Flannery, Mr. H. C. Richards, Sir William Holland, and Mr. Howard; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, and to be printed. [Bill 222.] 808

Licensing Bill.—On the order for going into Committee on this Bill
Mr. Speaker 808

(Considered in Committee.)

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 1:—

Mr. Whittaker (*Yorkshire, W.R., Spen Valley*) 809

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Clause 1 be postponed."—(*Mr. Whittaker.*)

The Secretary of State for the Home Department (*Mr. Akers Douglas, Kent, St. Augustines*) 813
Mr. Ellis Griffith (*Anglesey*) 813
Mr. Lloyd George (*Carnarvon Boroughs*) 814
Sir Robert Reid (*Dumfries Burghs*) 815
Mr. Herbert Roberts (*Denbighshire, W.*) 815
Mr. Emmott (*Oldham*) 816
Mr. Herbert Samuel (*Yorkshire, Cleveland*) 817
Mr. Trevelyan (*Yorkshire, W.R., Elland*) 817

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 116; Noes, 227. (Division List No. 134.)
Mr. Ellis Griffith 821

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, a line 5, to insert, at the beginning, the words 'During the period of seven years after the passing of this Act.'"—(*Mr. Ellis Griffith.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir J. Fergusson (*Manchester, N.E.*) 829
Mr. Chaplin (*Lincolnshire, Sleaford*) 829
Colonel Williams (*Dorsetshire, W.*) 829
Mr. Haldane (*Haddingtonshire*) 830
The Prime Minister and the First Lord of the Treasury (*Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.*) 830
Sir Edward Grey (*Northumberland, Berwick*) 831
Sir William Houldsworth (*Manchester, N.W.*) 831
Mr. Lough (*Islington, W.*) 832
Mr. A. J. Balfour 832
Mr. Lloyd Wharton (*Yorkshire, W.R., Ripon*) 838
Mr. Henry Chaplin 839

Sir John Kennaway (*Devonshire, Honiton*) 840
Sir Walter Thorburn, (*Peebles and Selkirk*) 841
Sir William Houldsworth 842
Mr. Milvain (*Hampstead*) 845
Colonel Williams 848

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

'To leave out the word 'seven,' insert the word 'fourteen.'"—(*Colonel Williams.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'seven' stand part of the proposed Amendment."

Mr. Whittaker 849
Sir Frederick Milner (*Nottinghamshire, Bassetlaw*) 860
Mr. Courtenay Warner (*Staffordshire, Lichfield*) 861
Mr. Cripps (*Lancashire, Stretford*) 862
Mr. Haldane 865
Mr. Duke (*Plymouth*) 866
Mr. Markham (*Nottinghamshire, Mansfield*) 869

And, it being half-past Seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

Licensing Bill.—Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 1:—

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 5, to insert, at the beginning, the words 'During the period of seven years after the passing of this Act.'"—(*Mr. Ellis Griffith.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"To leave out the word 'seven' and insert the word 'fourteen.'"—(*Colonel Williams.*)

Question again proposed, "That the word 'seven' stand part of the proposed Amendment."

Major Jameson (*Clare, W.*) 870
Mr. Roland Hunt (*Shropshire, Ludlow*) 872
Sir John Gorst (*Cambridge University*) 873
Mr. Herbert Roberts 876

June 7.]

Page

Sir Frederick Banbury (*Camberwell, Peckham*) 877
Mr. Emmott 878
Lord Hugh Cecil (*Greenwich*) 881
Mr. Robson (*South Shields*) 885
Mr. Austen Taylor (*Liverpool, E. Toxteth*) 889
Mr. Worsley-Taylor (*Lancashire, Blackpool*) 890
Sir Edward Grey 893
The Secretary of State for the Colonies (*Mr. Lyttelton, Warwick and Leamington* 896
Mr. Nussey (*Pontefract*) 898
Mr. Bousfield (*Hackney, N.*) 900
Mr. Atherley-Jones (*Durham, N. W.*) 903

And, it being midnight, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again to-morrow.

Adjourned at five minutes after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS: TUESDAY, 7TH JUNE, 1904.

MESSAGE FROM THE KING.

THE LATE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY.—The King's Answer to the Address of the 17th of May last reported by the Lord Steward (*E. Pembroke and Montgomery* 905

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Torquay Tramways Bill.—A witness ordered to attend the Select Committee. 905

Acton Improvement Bill.—Reported with Amendments. 905

Trafford Park Dock and Railway Bill [H.L.]—now Trafford Park Bill [H.L.]—Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments 905

Canal Rates and Charges (Regent's Canal) Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.] —Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [H.L.]; Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [H.L.]; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill [H.L.] Committed. The Committees to be proposed by the Committee of Selection 905

Harlow and Sawbridgeworth Gas Bill [H.L.]—Commons Amendments considered, and agreed to 905

Harrow Road and Paddington Tramways Bill.—The LORD CHANCELLOR informed the House that the opposition to the Bill was withdrawn. The orders made on the 13th and 17th of May last, discharged, and Bill committed 905

Bristol Tramways (Extensions) Bill [H.L.].—The LORD CHANCELLOR informed the House that the opposition to the Bill was withdrawn. The orders made on the 24th March and 17th of May last discharged, and Bill committed 906

June 7.]

Page

Midland Railway Bill.—The Lord Chancellor informed the House that the opposition to the Bill was withdrawn. The orders made on the 28th of April and 17th of May last discharged, and Bill committed for Friday next .. 906

Plymouth Corporation Bill.—Read 2^a, and committed 906

Sheppy Gas Bill.—Read 3^a, and passed 906

Richard Jaeger's Patent Bill [H.L.]—Read 3^a, and passed, and sent to the Commons 906

Colney Hatch Gas Bill.—North Staffordshire Railway Bill; Gomersal Gas Bill. Read 3^a, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons 906

Wolverhampton Corporation Bill.—Oakengates, Dawley, and District Joint Water Board Bill [H.L.]; Humber Commercial Railway and Dock Bill; Great Central Railway Bill. Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Earl of Dartrey be proposed to the House as a member of the Select Committee on the said Bills in the place of the Earl of Belmore, and that the Earl of Dartrey be Chairman of the said Committee; read, and agreed to 906

Commons Regulation (Merrow) Provisional Order Bill.—Commons Regulation (Oxshott) Provisional Order Bill; Land Drainage Provisional Order Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (Gas) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 12) Bill; North British Railway (General Powers) Order Confirmation Bill. Brought from the Commons; read 1^a to be printed; and referred to the Examiners 906

Carlisle Corporation Bill.—Lytham Improvement Bill; Radcliffe Tramways and Improvement Bill; London United Tramways Bill; Middlesborough Stockton-on-Tees, and Thornaby Tramways Bill; Thames River Steamboat Service Bill. Brought from the Commons; read 1^a; and referred to the Examiners 906

Paisley District Tramways Order Confirmation Bill (No. 92).—North British Railway (General Powers) Order Confirmation Bill (No. 93.) Read 1^a; to be printed; and pursuant to the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act (1899) deemed to have been read 2^a) The Lord Kintore (*E. Kintore*), and reported from the Committee 907

Water Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.].—Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.]; Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 3) Bill [H.L.]; Read 2^a (according to order) 907

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (Birmingham) Bill [H.L.].—Read 3^a (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons 907

Govan Burgh (Electricity) Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to 907

June 7.] *Page*

Elysée Palace Hotel Company, Limited, Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments 907

Liverpool and London and Globe Insurance Company Bill [H.L.].—University of Leeds Bill [H.L.]; York Town and Blackwater Gas Bill [H.L.]; Chesterfield Corporation (Tramways and Improvements) Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments considered, and agreed to 907

Croydon Gas Bill.—Chippenham Gas Bill. Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to 907

PARLIAMENTARY PAPERS (RECESS).

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House that the following Papers, having been commanded to be presented to this House by His Majesty, had been so presented on the following dates by delivery to the Clerk of the Parliaments. pursuant to Standing Order No. CXI., viz. :—

TRADE REPORTS—I. (ANNUAL SERIES).—No. 3168. Turkey (Basra); No. 3169. China (Newchang) (May 20); No. 3170. Turkey (Smyrna, etc.) (May 26); No. 3171 France (Havre, etc.); No. 3172. France (Budget for 1904); No. 3173. Russia (Rostov-on-Don); No. 3174. China (Chinkiang) (May 28); No. 3175. United States (Boston) (May 31); No. 3176. France (Brest) (June 3) 907

II. (MISCELLANEOUS SERIES).—No. 610. Industrial Development of Italy; No. 611. Navigation Schools in Germany (June 3) 908

MINES AND QUARRIES.—I. Report to the Secretary of State for the Home Department, by J. S. Haldane, Esq., M.D., F.R.S.; J.S. Martin, Esq., His Majesty's Inspector of Mines, and R. A. Thomas, Esq., on the health of Cornish miners (May 25); II. (General Report and Statistics for 1903: Part I. District Statistics)—Statistics of the persons employed, output, and accidents at mines and quarries in the United Kingdom, arranged according to the Inspection Districts (June 3) 908

COLONIES (ANNUAL).—No. 415. Falkland Islands (Report for 1903) (May 25); No. 416. Leeward Islands (Report for 1902–1903) (June 3) 908

FISHERIES (SCOTLAND).—Twenty-second Annual Report of the Fishery Board for Scotland, being for the year 1903: Part II. Salmon Fisheries (May 25) 908

MILITIA AND VOLUNTEERS (ROYAL COMMISSION).—Report of the Royal Commission on the Militia and Volunteers (May 25) 908

IRISH LAND COMMISSION (PROCEEDINGS).—Return for the month of January, 1904 (May 25) 908

MARRIAGES, BIRTHS, AND DEATHS (IRELAND).—Supplement to the Thirty-seventh Report of the Registrar-General, containing decennial summaries for the years 1891–1900 (May 25) 908

DUBLIN METROPOLITAN POLICE.—Statistical tables for the year 1903 (May 27) 908

TUBERCULOSIS (HUMAN AND BOVINE) (ROYAL COMMISSION).—Interim Report of the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the relations of human and animal tuberculosis (May 27) 909

June 7.]

Page

FRANCE (No. 2) (1904).—Notes exchanged between the Marquess of Lansdowne and the French Ambassador on signature of the Convention and Declarations of 8th April, 1904 (May 31) 909

TRANSVAAL.—Despatch from the Governor of the Transvaal, enclosing a return with regard to the magistrates of the colony (May 31) 909

ARMY (MEDICAL DEPARTMENT).—Report for the year 1902 (June 1) 909

BANKING AND RAILWAY STATISTICS (IRELAND).—Report for December 1903 (June 1) 909

DISEASES OF ANIMALS ACTS.—Report of Proceedings as regards Ireland for the year 1903 (June 1) 909

SOUTHERN RHODESIA.—Correspondence relating to the proposed introduction of Indentured Asiatic (Chinese) Labour into Southern Rhodesia (in continuation of [Cd. 1200], July, 1902) (June 1) 909

COMMERCIAL, No. 5 (1904).—Further findings of the Permanent Commission established under Article VII. of the Sugar Convention of 5th March, 1902, and further reports of the British Delegate (in continuation of "Commercial" No. 6 (1903) (June 1) 909

INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION BOARD (IRELAND).—Annual Report for the year 1903 (June 2) 909

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND).—Thirty-first Annual Report by the Accountant for Scotland to the Scotch Education Department (June 2) 909

EXPLOSIVES ACT, 1875.—Twenty-eighth Annual Report of His Majesty's Inspectors of Explosives, being their annual Report for the year 1903. (June 3) ..

The same were ordered to lie on the Table 910

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).—No. 3161. United States (Philadelphia); No. 3162. China (Kiungchow (Hoihow); No. 3163. Netherlands (Java); No. 3177. United States (Porto Rico); No. 3178. Portugal (South Portugal) No. 3179. Greece (The Cyclades) 910

WEST AFRICA.—Statement of the revenue and expenditure and the trade of the Gambia, Sierra Leone, and the Gold Coast, from the year 1895, and of Lagos and Southern and Northern Nigeria from the year 1900 910

EXPLOSIVES (EXPLOSION AT THE FACTORY OF MESSRS. CURTIS AND HARVEY, LIMITED, AT CLIFFE, KENT).—Report to the right hon. the Secretary of State for the Home Department, by Major A. Cooper-Key, His Majesty's Inspector of Explosives, on the circumstances attending an explosion of nitroglycerine in the separating house of the factory of Messrs. Curtis and Harvey, Limited, at Cliffe, Kent, on the 18th February, 1904 910

METROPOLITAN GAS COMMITTEE.—Report of the Departmental Committee appointed to inquire and report as to gas testing in the Metropolis 910

June 7.] *Page*

STRIKES AND LOCK-OUTS (BOARD OF TRADE (LABOUR DEPARTMENT).—Report on the strikes and lock-outs in the United Kingdom in 1903, and on Conciliation and Arbitration Boards 910

SIGHT TESTS.—Report on the sight tests used in the mercantile marine, for the year ended 31st December, 1903 (in continuation of [Cd. 1580]) 910

MINES AND QUARRIES.—Reports of His Majesty's Inspectors of Mines and Quarries for the year 1903 .. ..

Presented [by Command], and ordered to lie on the Table 911

INDIA (PROGRESS AND CONDITION).—Statement exhibiting the moral and material progress and condition of India, during the year 1902–1903. (Thirty-ninth Number) 911

POST OFFICE (MONEY ORDERS).—Statutory Rules and Orders, 1904. No. 747 .. 911

LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL.

Returns relating to the Council—I. Return showing, up to 31st March, 1904:

The amount of Consolidated Stock.

The application of the money raised by such stock.

The sums carried to the Consolidated Loans Fund.

The application of the Consolidated Loans Fund.

An estimate of the expenditure of the Council for all purposes, for the year ending 31st March, 1905.

II.—Return showing up, to 31st March, 1904:—

All moneys raised by the Metropolitan Board of Works and the Council since the passing of the Act for the purposes mentioned in the Act.

Particulars in relation to every parish, district, union, or place in respect whereof a loan has been obtained from the Metropolitan Board of Works or the Council since the passing of the Act. 911

PUBLIC RECORDS (HOME OFFICE (CENSUS PAPERS)).—Schedule, containing a list and particulars of classes of documents which were returned to the office of His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Home Department, and which are now in the Public Record Office, but are not considered of sufficient public value to justify their preservation therein 911

AGRICULTURE AND TECHNICAL INSTRUCTION (IRELAND) ACT, 1899.—Three Minutes by the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction for Ireland sanctioning forms of instruction for the county borough of Cork and the urban district of Athlone 912

POLLING DISTRICTS.—Orders made by the county councils of the counties of—West Riding of York, altering certain polling districts in the Hallamshire Parliamentary Division; Warwick, altering certain polling districts in the county; Stafford, altering certain polling districts in the Handsworth Parliamentary Division 912

Prison Acts, 1865 to 1898.—Draft of new rules proposed to be made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department for the government of convict prisons 912

Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899.—Report by the Chairman of Committees of the House of Lords and the Chairman of Ways and Means in the House of Commons that the provisions of the Loch Leven Water Power Order and the Loch Leven Water Power Order (Extension of Time) Orders are of such a character that they ought to be dealt with by Private Bills and not by Provisional Orders.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table .. 912

Seamen's and Soldiers' False Characters Bill [H.L.].—[Second Reading.]—Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

The Under-Secretary of State for War (*The Earl of Donoughmore*) .. 912

Moved, " That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Earl of Donoughmore.*)

On Question, Bill read 2ª (according to order), and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Thursday next.

Street Betting Bill [H.L.].—Read 3ª (according to order); an Amendment made; Bill passed, and sent to the Commons 913

House adjourned at twenty minutes before Five o'clock, to Thursday next, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: TUESDAY, 7TH JUNE, 1904.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Alexandra (Newport and South Wales) Docks and Railway Bill [Lords].—To be read a second time upon Tuesday next 914

Barrow-in-Furness Corporation Bill [Lords).—Bournemouth Corporation (Tramways) Bill [Lords]; Bristol Corporation Bill [Lords]; Filey Improvement Bill [Lords]; Great Western Railway Bill [Lords]; Holywood Tramways Bill [Lords]; North Wales Electric Power Bill [Lords]; Portmadoc. Beddgelert, and South Snowdon Railway Bill [Lords]; Preston Corporation Water Bill [Lords]; St. Mary Woolnoth Bill [Lords]. Read a second time, and committed. 914

Standing Orders.—Ordered, That so much of Standing Order 91 as fixes Five as the quorum of the Select Committee on Standing Orders be read, and suspended. Ordered, That for the remainder of the Session Three be the quorum of the Committee.—(*Mr. Halsey.*) 914

June 7.] *Page*

Loch Leven Water Power Bill.—"To confer further Powers on the Loch Leven Water and Electric Power Company; and to extend the time for the purchase of lands and for the completion of part of the authorised works of that Company; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills. 914

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP I).—Ordered, That Mr. Mosely Somers Gardner, Surgeon General Faught, Mr. Edwin Bradshaw, and Mr. George Ebenezer Stares do extend the Committee on Group I of Private Bills To-morrow, at half-past Eleven of the clock 914

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to—

St. Marylebone Electric Lighting Bill, with Amendments.

Amendments to—Cambrian Railways Bill [Lords]; Nuneaton and Chilvers Coton Urban Distric Council Bill [Lords], without Amendment .. 915

PETITIONS.

ALKALI, ETC., WORKS REGULATION BILL.—Petition from Manchester, in favour; to lie upon the Table 915

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petitions for alteration; from Leith; Dalgety; and Sorn; to lie upon the Table.. 915

HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES, ETC., BILL.—Petition from Portsmouth, against; to lie upon the Table 915

LAND VALUES (ASSESSMENT AND RATING BILL).—Petition from Burton-upon-Trent, in favour; to lie upon the Table 915

LICENSING BILL.—Petitions against; from Burley in Wharfedale; Manaccan; Otley; Stoke Newington; Devonport (two); Southampton (two); Upton Cross; Ilfracombe (two); Barnstaple; Woolfardisworthy; Welcombe; Newton Abbot (two); Mortonhampstead; Kettering (four); Hornsey; Watlington; Caversham; Britwell Salome and Ewelme; Russell's Water; Henley on Thames; Watlington; Chalgrove; Glasgow (six); Notting Hill; Darlington; East Dereham; Forest Hill; Derby (four); Ingatestone (two); Cooksmill Green; Norton Heath; Hatfield; Brentford; Saint Albans; Salford; Leyton; Coatbridge (two); Holbrook; Bayswater; Tamworth; Battersea; Lymm; Northenden; Bowdon (two); Blackburn; Hammersmith; Bedminster; Finchley; Wavertree; Bristol (six); Lanark; Anniesland; Bridlington; Blaydon; Whickham; Carstairs; Mitian; Silverwell; Saint Agnes; Dunston-on-Tyne; Appledore; Bideford; Lancaster; Gloucester; Kidderminster (two); Birmingham (three); Little Milton; Great Milton; Wilmslow; Brighton; Stirling North; Lancaster; Galgate; Warton; Wray; Tewitfield; Arkholme; Holme; Waterloo; Caton; Silverdale; Worksop; Kingsteignton; Newtown; Northfield; Flixton; Davyhulme; Esh Winning; Durham; Mount Hawk; Carfnorth; Lozant Callington; Camelford; Aslacton; Harwich; Govan; Selly Oak (two); Edinburgh; Little Hulton; Altrincham; Sale; Knutsford; Saffron Walden; Radford; Oxford; Bellshill; Tayport;

Fenny Stratford; Exeter (two); Chudleigh; Lustleigh; St. Martin; Rushden; Stanwick; Rowley Regis; Cumberland; Dumfries; Perranporth; Coverack; Manchester (four); Wheal Frances; Montrose (two); Arbroath (two); Kennington Lane; Bovey Tracey (two); High Blantyre; Walsingham (two); Forfar; Forfar North; Brechin; Spring Hill; St. Keverne; West Dean; Bradford; Greenock; Ecclefechan; Stoke Newington; Nottingham; Coventry (two); Women's Liberal Federation; Folkestone, Mawnan; Hinckley; Thornaby on Tees; Stockton on Tees (two); Bath (two); Bridge; Radstock; Camerton; Wells; Wishaw; Withington; Brixham; Deptford; Woburn Sands; Bletchley; Eltham; East Ham; Wanstead; Tenby; Great Malvern (two); Malvern Link; Small Heath, Bolingey; Fife; Keighley (four); Winterbourne; Chelston; Iron Acton; Highbury; Penzance; Islington; Teddington; Upper Boddington; Surbiton; Hanworth; Hampton; Abingdon; Salford (two); Southport (three); Princetown (seven); Grasslot; Maryport (four); Congleton; Shepley; Portsmouth; Fakenham; London; Gunwen; Greenock; Beeston; Alveston; Wigton; Morecambe; Matterdale; Newbiggin; Dundee; Stainton; Newton Heath (four); Norwich (four); Polmont; Blowick; Everton; Newchurch; St. Just (three); St. Ives; Prestleigh; Pilton; Middlesbrough (two); Ayr; Torrington; Newton; Denby Dale (two); Skelmanthorpe; Lower Cumberworth; Congleton; Stevenage; Walkern; Macclesfield (four); Kirkford; Randwick; Standish; Drayton; Ryecroft; Stirling; Kilsyth; Stirlingshire; Penrith; Hampton Hill; Slaithwaite; Brigham and Cockermouth; Thornbury; Ilkeston; Luton, Rye Hill; Bolton (two); Lower Withington; Eastville Park; Hertford; Middlewich; Davenport; Chester (two); Tallywain; Intake; Lancashire and Cheshire; Fulshaw; Morley; Wilmslow (two); Frampton Cotterell; Luddenden Dean; Luddenden; Earthcott Green; Grimsbury; Cosham; Heatherlands; Chipping Warden; Thornaby on Tees; Lambeth; Portobello; Lancaster; Westminster; Calverton; Mold; Wilsden; Kinross; Skeeby; Thornton; Townhill; Taunton; Almondsbury; Pocklington; Chorley; Elvaston; Hulton; Olveston; Stroud; and Fareham; to lie upon the Table 915

LICENSING BILL.—Petitions for alteration; from Penzance; Tottenham (two); Leith; Westbury on Trym; Clacton on Sea; and South Tottenham; to lie upon the Table 917

RE-VACCINATION BILL.—Petitions against; from Poplar; and Keighley; to lie upon the Table 917

RE-VACCINATION BILL.—Petition from Bermondsey, in favour; to lie upon the Table 917

SEA FISHERIES BILL [LORDS].—Petition from Lowestoft, against; to lie upon the Table 917

VALUATION BILL.—Petition from Ely, against; to lie upon the Table 917

VALUATION BILL.—Petitions for alteration; from Sunderland; Southwell; and Goole; to lie upon the Table 917

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

COUNTY COURTS (IRELAND) REGISTRARS (SALARIES, ETC.).—Return [presented 31st May] to be printed. [No. 198.] 917

INDIAN ARMY (MEMORANDUM).—Return presented, relative thereto [Address 3rd June; *Sir Howard Vincent*]; to lie upon the Table 918

June 7.] *Page*

MINES AND QUARRIES.—Copy presented, of Reports of His Majesty's Inspectors of Mines for the year 1903 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 918

PRISONS (RULES FOR CONVICT PRISONS).—Copy presented, of Draft of New Rules proposed to be made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department for the goverment of Convict Prisons [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 199.] 918

METROPOLITAN GAS (DEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE).—Copy presented, of Report of the Departmental Committee appointed to inquire and report as to Gas Testing in the Metropolis [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 918

PUBLIC WORKS (IRELAND).—Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 3rd June, 1904, authorising the lease of a house and small yard attached, at the landward end of the West Pier, Kingstown [by Act]; to lie upon the Table .. 918

SUPERANNUATION ACT, 1887.—Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 2nd June, 1904, granting a retired allowance to Matthew Farrelly, Examining Officer, 2nd Class, Liverpool, Customs [by Act]; to lie upon the Table .. 918

EAST INDIA (NATURAL FERTILISERS).—Address for "Copy of Memorandum on the subject of the existence of natural fertilisers in India in proximity to land suitable for growing cotton, prepared by the Department of Agriculture in India."—(*Mr. Emmott.*) 918

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

HOLIDAYS OF METROPOLITAN POLICE FORCE.—Question, Mr. Lough (Islington, W.); Answer, Mr. Akers-Douglas 918

UNDERSIZED FISH BILL—DATE OF SECOND READING.—Question, Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 919

WATER SUPPLY OF ERBUSAIG SCHOOL, ROSS-SHIRE.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 919

DISCIPLINE IN SCOTTISH POORHOUSES—AMALGAMATION OF SCOTTISH POORHOUSES.—Question, Mr. Haldane (Haddingtonshire); Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 920

CERTIFICATES OF DEDUCTIONS OF INCOME TAX ON COUPONS OF CONSOL CERTIFICATES.—Question, Mr. Herbert Samuel (Yorkshire, Cleveland); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 921

SALE OF THE FITZGERALD ESTATE, COUNTY MAYO.—Question, Dr. Ambrose (Mayo, W.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 921

ELECTRIC LIGHTING FOR THE FOUR COURTS, DUBLIN.—Question, Mr. Hemphill (Tyrone, N.); Answer, Mr. Victor Cavendish 922

PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION BILL—SECOND READING.—Question, Mr. Channing (Northamptonshire, E.); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 922

June 7.]

Page

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

TRAINING VESSELS AND THE WESTERN HIGHLANDS.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Pretyman, Suffolk, Woodbridge) 922

PUNISHMENT OF NATIVES IN THE TRANSVAAL MINES.—Question, Mr. Whitley (Halifax); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Lyttelton, Warwick and Leamington) 923

CHINESE LABOUR IN THE TRANSVAAL.—Question, Mr. Herbert Samuel (Yorkshire, Cleveland); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 923

INDIA'S CONTRIBUTION TO AND BENEFITS FROM THE IMPERIAL INSTITUTE.—Question, Sir Mancherjee Bhownaggree (Bethnal Green, N.E.); Answer, The Secretary of State for India (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford) .. 923

PROTECTION OF MECCA PILGRIMS.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, The Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Earl Percy, Kensington, S.) 924

REPATRIATION OF MACEDONIAN REFUGEES.—Question, Mr. Whitley; Answer, Earl Percy 925

THE MACEDONIAN GENDARMERIE.—Question, Mr. Herbert Samuel; Answer, Earl Percy 925

MACEDONIAN REFORM—REPORT OF ASSESSORS.—Question. Mr. Charles Allen (Gloucestershire, Stroud); Answer, Earl Percy 926

ADMINISTRATION OF COLONIAL POSSESSIONS.—Questions. Mr. Herbert Samuel, Mr. Cathcart Wason (Orkney and Shetland), and Mr. Bayley (Derbyshire, Chesterfield); Answer, Earl Percy 927

INCOME TAX ABATEMENTS.—Question, Mr. Field (Dublin, St. Patrick); Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.) 927

OVER-PAYMENTS OF INCOME TAX.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Victor Cavendish, Derbyshire, W.) 928

FEMALE LEARNERS IN PROVINCIAL POST OFFICES.—Question, Sir John Leng (Dundee); Answer, The Postmaster-General (Lord Stanley, Lancashire, Westhoughton) 928

HOSPITAL ACCOMMODATION IN ROSS-SHIRE.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. Graham Murray, Buteshire) 928

WATER SUPPLY IN ROSS-SHIRE SCHOOLS.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 929

TRALEE AND DINGLE RAILWAY.—Questions, Mr. Field, Mr. Nannetti (Dublin, College Green), and Mr. Murphy (Kerry, E.); Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 929

THE IRISH SOCIETY'S LONDONDERRY ESTATES.—Questions, Mr. O'Doherty (Donegal, N.) and Mr. T. W. Russell (Tyrone, S.); Answers, Mr. Wyndham 930

June 7.] *Page*

IRISH JOINT STOCK BANKS AND THE BANKING ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE LAND ACTS.—Question, Mr. John Redmond (Waterford); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 931

OVERTIME AT OMAGH POST OFFICE.—Question, Mr. Joyce (Limerick); Answer, Lord Stanley 932

CORNERS IN COTTON—THE ZURICH CONGRESS.—Questions, Mr. Field and Mr. Markham (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield); Answers, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 932

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).—Mr. HALSEY reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had added to the Standing Committee on Trade (including Agriculture and Fishing), Shipping, and Manufactures, the following fifteen Members in respect of the Shop Hours Bill: Mr. William Abraham (Rhondda), Sir Frederick Banbury, Mr. Cameron Corbett, Sir Charles Dilke, Sir Walter Foster, Mr. Ernest Gray, Mr. Bonar Law, Mr. William Lawrence, Dr. Macnamara, Captain Norton, Sir Francis Sharp Powell, Mr. Herbert Robertson, Mr. Thornton, Mr. Herbert Samuel, and Mr. Whitley.

Report to lie upon the Table 933

LICENSING BILL.—

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 1:—

Amendment again proposed—

"In page 1, line 5, to insert, at the beginning the words 'During the period of seven years after the passing of this Act.'"—(*Mr. Ellis Griffith.*)

Question again proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Amendment again proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"To leave out the word 'seven,' and insert the word 'fourteen"—(*Colonel Williams.*)

Question again proposed, "That the word 'seven' stand part of the proposed Amendment."

Mr. Atherley-Jones (Durham, N.W.) 934
Sir George Bartley (Islington, N.) 935
Sir Robert Reid (Dumfries Burghs) 939
The Solicitor-General (Sir Edward Carson, Dublin University) 949
Mr. Lloyd-George (Carnarvon Boroughs) 955
Mr. Groves (Salford, S.) 962
Mr. Corbett (Glasgow, Tradeston) 964
Mr. Bryce (Aberdeen, S.) 967
Sir Edgar Vincent (Exeter) 970
Mr. Charles Douglas (Lanarkshire, N. W.) 973

Page

Mr. Tritton (Lambeth, Norwood) 977
Mr. Henderson (Dublin, Barnard Castle) 979
Mr. Cohen (Islington, E.) 983
Mr. Lyell (Dorsetshire, E.) 985
Sir Mark Stewart (Kirkcudbrightshire) 989
Mr. Helme (Lancashire, Lancaster) 991

And, it being half-past Seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

LICENSING BILL.

Considered in Committee:—

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 1:—

Amendment again proposed—

"In page 1, line 5, to insert, at the beginning, the words 'During the period of seven years after the passing of this Act.'"—(*Mr. Ellis Griffith.*)

Question again proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Amendment again proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"To leave out the word 'seven,' and insert the word 'fourteen"—(*Colonel Williams.*)

Question again proposed, "That the word 'seven' stand part of proposed Amendment."

Mr. A. K. Loyd (Berkshire, Abingdon) 994
Mr. Harwood (Bolton) 998
Sir Philip Muntz (Warwickshire, Tamworth) 1001
Mr. Thomas Shaw (Hawick Burghs) 1002
Mr. George White (Norfolk, N.W.) 1008
Mr. Alexander Cross (Glasgow, Camlachie) 1012
The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 1013
Mr. Slack (Hertfordshire, St. Albans) 1021

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR rose in his place and claimed to move that the Question be now put.

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 289; Noes, 205. (Division List No. 135.)

Question put accordingly, " That the word ' seven ' stand part of the proposed Amendment."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 306 ; Noes, 187. (Division List No. 136.)

Whereupon Mr. A. J. BALFOUR claimed, " That the Main Question be now put. '

Question put accordingly, " That the words ' During the period of seven years after the passing of this Act ' be there inserted."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 192 ; Noes, 290. (Division List No. 137.)

And, it being after Midnight, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress ; to sit again to-morrow.

Dean Forest Bill.

Read a second time, and committed to a Select Committee of Three Members, to be nominated by the Committee of Selection.

Ordered, That all Petitions against the Bill presented seven clear days before the meeting of the Committee be referred to the Committee ; that the Petitioners praying to be heard by themselves, their Counsel, or Agents be heard against the Bill, and Counsel heard in support of the Bill.

Ordered, That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records.—(*Mr. Victor Cavendish*) 1039

Adjourned at twenty minutes before One o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS : WEDNESDAY, 8TH JUNE, 1904.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Chesterfield Gas and Water Board Bill [LORDS].—London County Council (Money) Bill. As amended, considered ; to be read the third time 1041

Ticehurst and District Water and Gas Bill [LORDS].—Read a second time, and committed 1041

PETITIONS.

ALKALI, ETC., WORKS BILL.—Petition from Manchester and Salford, in favour ; to lie upon the Table] 1041

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition from Dunfermline, against ; to lie upon the Table 1041

Education (Scotland) Bill.—Petition from Glasgow, for alteration; to lie upon the Table 1041

House-Letting (Scotland) Bill.—Petition from Arbroath, for alteration; to lie upon the Table 1041

Housing of the Working Classes, etc., Bill.—Petition from Sheffield, against, to lie upon the Table 1041

Licensing Bill.—Petitions against; from Altrincham; Walthamstow (three); Heywood; Exeter; Rodley; East Ham; Wimbledon; Seghill; Glasbury; Taunton (two); Bearpark; Henshaw; Willesden Green; Gravesend; Hereford; Tilehurst; Hoxton; Reading; Hebburn Colliery; Newcastle-upon-Tyne (nine); Egremont; North Shields; Blackhill; Fenny Stratford; Fleetwood; Awsworth; Fulham; Dawes; W. Whatmough; New Herrington; Corris; South Tottenham; Finsbury Square; Alverstoke; Houghton le Spring; Sleaford; Preston; Tipton; King's Lynn; Whiteinch; Lower Wortley; Pentre; Hopwood; Bideford; Brixton; Esh; Hither Green; Meopham; Merthyr Tydvil; Tongham; Weston-super-Mare; Kingsbridge; Hull (three); Cardiff; Enfield Wash; Teignmouth; Lewes; South Shields; Cwmaman; Harry Haines and another (two); Luton (two); Swadlincote; Blaenrhondda (three); William Armistead; Bexley; John Sidney Smith and another; Waterhouses (three); Mytholmroyd; Coleford; Hamsteels; Broompark; Liverpool; Blackwood; Towyn; Alexandra R. Macfarline and others; Bury Saint Edmunds; Newport (Mon.) (five); Stilton; Whitechapel; Nelson (eleven); New Clee and Weelsby; Putney; Cheddar (four); Bourton on the Water; Bridgwater; Tow Law; Lancaster; Bedminster (two); Brigham; Isle of Thanet; Clayton West; Wesleyan Temperance Society; Cameley; Ipswich (two); Willington Quay; New Hirst; Southampton; Worthing; Shotts; Abercynon; Derby (six); Leicester; Leeds; Llanfiehill; Forest Fach; Old Buckenham; Balsall Heath; Shildon; Willesden and Harlesden; Atherstone; Old Street; Long Sutton; Highbridge; Stratford; Margate; Southport; Westbury-on-Trym; Heckmondwike; Hyde; South Bristol; Bellshill (two); Motherwell; Stirling; Kinross and West Fife; Dunfermline; Greenock (two); Pemberton; Sheffield (three); Husband Bosworth; Harden; Birmingham (nine); Kingston on Hull; Newton Mearns; Pentre; Tylorstown (two); Tynewyd; Edinburgh (three); Clapham; Haltwistle; Bury (three); Burton Salmon; Meopham; Grayshott; Castleford; Petersfield; Salford; Sunninghill; Colne (four); Wolstanton; Newcastle under Lyme; Tinhead; Biggleswade (two); Cranfield; Stotfold; Aberdeen; Gorton; Acton; Bingley (three); Eldwick Beck; Kings Heath; High Wycombe (four); Wolstanton; Longton; Gilstead; Clacton on Sea; Eadington; Watford; Oxford; Apperley Bridge; Melksham; East Morton; Castlefields; Ferndale; Mardy; Ynyshir; Castleford; Canterbury; Knockholt; Chelsfield; Shoreham; Otford; Cudham; Ightham; Weald; Sevenoaks; Wachet and Williton; Ashton under Lyme (two); Mabe; Dalston; Barking; Enfield; Plymouth; Forest Hill (two); Streatham Common; Halifax (two); Castleford; Leigh (five); Banbury; Loughborough; Woodburn and Bourne End; Wycombe; Bournemouth (four); Warmington; Wooler; Lowick; Spittal; Cotteridge; Caledonian Road; West Hartlepool (three); Dumfries and Maxwelltown; Annan; Manchester (four); Kingsteignton; Willenhall (three); Moffat; Redhill; Earlswood; Stoke Newington; Stalbridge; South Manchester (three); Micklethwaite; Parkstone; Frinton on Sea; Kilmarnock; Oldham; Brightlingsea; Farnworth; Aberavon; Chorlton on Medlock; Rusholme; Whalley Range; Cubitt Town;

June 8.] *Page*

Rothesay; Hurst Brook; West Auckland; Gryffe Bank; Howden le Wear; Amble; Ashington; Wallington (Cambs); Sidlesham; Lightcliffe; Earlestown (two); Golborne; Ashton in Makerfield; Marlow; Amersham; Winchmore Hill; Flackwell Heath; Lane End; Booker; Downley; Trowbridge (two); North West Ham; Forest Gate; West Ham Lane; Warwick; Leamington; Bideford; Hartlepool; Manaton; Newton Abbot; Farnsfield; Middleton in Teesdale; Westminster; Southend on Sea; Bradford; Lowton; Glasgow (three); Greenheys (two); Haydon (four); Horsley on Tyne; Hanley; Chesterfield; Shirebrook; Glenboig; Bedminster; Newington Butts; Bolton Low Houses; Dacre; Penrith; Alva; Burrill; Steeten; Nantwich; Seaton Delaval; Blackley; Hooley Hill; Cotton Tree; Brimscombe; Clayton le Moors; Tarleton; Mapperley; Ayrshire; Draycott; Penruddock; Watermillock; Croydon (two); Oakridge; Clifton (three); Warlingham; Wisbech; Henderskelf; Walsall; Tulse Hill and West Norwood; Ganthorpe Terrington; Leek; Ogden; Buxton; Glossop; Kenley; Biddulph; Saint Pancras; Looe; Polperro; Salisbury; Heaton Moor; Moss Side; Old Trafford; Reddish; Levenshulme; Ipswich; Great Torrington; Bolton; Tavistock; Hilderstone; Blencowe; Hutton End; Plumpton; Johnley; Stechford; Clifton and Redland; Llanelly; Milnrow; Bethnal Green; Brandon; Hedley Hill Terrace; Clitheroe; Breconshire; Talgarth; Hay; Otley; Mildmay Park; Wolverhampton; Broughton; Cheetham (three); Harthill; Cheetham and Crumpsall; Tottenham; Fishponds; Bristol (two); Clayton le Moors; Norwood; Magor; Foulsyke; Midgeholme; Maentwrog Crook; Cirencester; Carlisle; Redfield; Aston; Burnley; Chichester; Wellington; Reigate (three); Brighton; Lytham; and Folkingham; to lie upon the Table 1041

LICENSING BILL.—Petitions for alteration; from Braintree; Evesham; King's Heath; Bristol (two); and South Hackney; to lie upon the Table 1044

RE-VACCINATION BILL.—Petition from Trowbridge and Melksham, against; to lie upon the Table 1044

RE-VACCINATION BILL.—Petition from Salop, in favour; to lie upon the Table 1044

ROMAN CATHOLIC DISABILITIES REMOVAL BILL.—Petition from Glasgow, against; to lie upon the Table 1044

VALUATION BILL.—Petition from Eton, against; to lie upon the Table .. 1044

VALUATION BILL.—Petitions for alteration; from Burnley; and North Witchford; to lie upon the Table 1044

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

EAST INDIA (ARMY MEMORANDUM).—Return [presented 6th June] to be printed. [No. 200.] 1044

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND).—Copy presented, of Report by George Andrew, one of His Majesty's Inspectors of Schools in Scotland on The Gemeindeschulen of Berlin and Charlottenburg [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1044

June 8.] *Page*

UNIVERSITIES OF OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE ACT, 1877 (OXFORD).—Copy presented of Statute made by the Governing Body of Trinity College, Oxford, on 26th February, 1904, amending Statute VI. of the Statutes of the College [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 201.] .. 1044

BOARD OF TRADE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD.—Copy presented, of Report of the Committee appointed to consider the Position and Duties of the Board of Trade and of the Local Government Board [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1045

SUPERANNUATION ACT, 1884.—Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 25th May, 1904, declaring that George Hockett, Artificer, Royal Small Arms Factory, Enfield, was appointed without a Civil Service Certificate, through inadvertence on the part of the Head of his Department [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 1045

NAVIGATION AND SHIPPING.—Copy presented, of Annual Statement of Navigation and Shipping of the United Kingdom for the year 1903 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1045

HARWICH HARBOUR.—Copy presented, of Abstract of the Accounts of the Receipts and Expenditure of the Harwich Harbour Conservancy Board from the time of their incorporation down to and inclusive of the 31st March, 1904, etc. [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 202.] 1045

AFRICA, No. 7 (1904).—Copy presented, of Further Correspondence respecting the Administration of the Independent State of the Congo (in continuation of Africa, No. 1. 1904) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1045

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.—Inquiry into Charities (Administrative County of Durham). Further Return relative thereto [ordered 14th February, 1900; *Mr. Grant Lawson*]; to be printed. [No. 203.] 1045

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

NAVAL EXPENDITURE OF FRANCE, GERMANY AND RUSSIA.—Question, Mr. Runciman (Dewsbury); Answer, Mr. Pretyman 1045

MEDICAL OFFICER FOR DURNESS, SUTHERLAND.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 1046

BELGIAN AND SWEDISH OFFICERS OF TURKISH GENDARMERIE.—Question, Mr. Moon (St. Pancras, N.); Answer, Earl Percy 1047

EUROPEAN OFFICERS OF MACEDONIAN GENDARMERIE.—Question, Mr. Moon; Answer, Earl Percy 1047

COST OF MILITARY OPERATIONS IN SOMALILAND PRIOR TO OCTOBER, 1902.—Question, Mr. Lambert (Devonshire, South Molton); Answer, Earl Percy .. 1048

LIST OF DEATHS SUPPLIED BY REGISTRARS TO WEEKLY NEWSPAPERS.—Question, Sir Walter Foster (Derbyshire, Ilkeston); Answer, Mr. Walter Long .. 1048

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—RETURNS RELATING TO TRANSPORTS.—Question, Mr. Buchanan (Perthshire, E.); Answer, Mr. Pretyman 1049

June 8.] *Page*

ESTATE OF THE LATE MRS. HELEN BLAKE.—Question, Mr. P. J. O'Brien (Tipperary, N.); Answer, Mr. Victor Cavendish 1049

SUGGESTED SAND RIDE IN KENSINGTON GARDENS.—Question, Lord Cecil Manners (Leicestershire, Melton); Answer, Lord Balcarres 1050

TELEPHONIC ARRANGEMENTS IN TIPPERARY.—Question, Mr. P. J. O'Brien; Answer, Lord Stanley 1050

IRISH BANKS AND INLAND REVENUE.—Question, Mr. William Abraham (Cork Co., N.E.); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 1050

LICENCES FOR BREWING HOME MADE BEER.—Question, Mr. J. A. Pease (Essex, Saffron Walden); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 1052

RUSSIAN INFLUENCE IN TIBET.—Question, Mr. Schwann (Manchester, N.); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 1053

IRISH NATIONAL EDUCATION—EXAMINATION PAPERS UNDER THE NEW PROGRAMME.—Question, Mr. O'Doherty (Donegal, N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1053

FEES DUE TO TEACHERS FOR EVENING CLASSES IN COUNTY DONEGAL.—Question, Mr. O'Doherty; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1054

NEGLECT AT DROGHEDA MORTUARY.—Question, Mr. William Moore (Antrim, N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1054

WORK AT ENFIELD SMALL ARMS FACTORY.—Question, Mr. Shackleton (Lancashire, Clitheroe); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1055

PAY OF GENERAL OFFICERS COMMANDING-IN-CHIEF.—Question, Mr. Charles Hobhouse (Bristol, E.); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1055

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

LOSS OF SUBMARINE A1.—Question, Mr. Edmund Robertson (Dundee); Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Pretyman, Suffolk, Woodbridge) 1056

NAVAL GUNNERY.—Question, Mr. Seymour Ormsby-Gore (Lincolnshire, Gainsborough); Answer, Mr. Pretyman 1056

MALTA DOCKYARD EXTENSION WORKS.—Question, Mr. Galloway (Manchester, S. W.); Answer, The Civil Lord of the Admiralty (Mr. Arthur Lee, Hampshire, Fareham) 1057

ARMY ORGANISATION.—Question, Mr. Charles Hobhouse (Bristol, E.); Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Arnold-Forster, Belfast, W.) 1057

SALES OF GOVERNMENT STORES IN THE TRANSVAAL.—Question, Mr. Charles Hobhouse; Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1057

COMPULSORY MILITARY SERVICE.—Question, Sir Frederick Banbury (Camberwell, Peckham); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1057

NEW GOVERNMENT POWDER.—Question, Mr. Seymour Ormsby-Gore; Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1058

June 8.] *Page*

DISCHARGES OF WORKMEN FROM ENFIELD SMALL ARMS FACTORY.—Question, Captain Norton (Newington, W.); Mr. Jesse Collings (Birmingham, Bordesley), and Mr. Crooks (Woolwich); Answer, The Financial Secretary to the War Office (Mr. Bromley Davenport, Cheshire, Macclesfield) 1058

LABOUR OVERSEERS IN THE TRANSVAAL.—Questions, Mr. Markham (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield), Mr. Herbert Samuel (Yorkshire, Cleveland), and Mr. Lough (Islington, W.); Answers, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Lyttelton, Warwick and Leamington) 1059

AGRICULTURAL LABOUR IN THE TRANSVAAL.—Question, Mr. Seymour Ormsby-Gore; Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 1060

SALE OF INTOXICANTS TO CHINESE LABOURERS.—Question, Captain Ellice (St. Andrews Burghs); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 1061

JAPAN AND ASIATIC LABOUR IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.—Question, Mr. Charles Devlin (Galway); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 1061

TRANSVAAL FINANCE.—Question, Major Seely (Isle of Wight); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 1062

RUSSIAN AND GERMAN AGREEMENT.—Question, Major Evans Gordon (Tower Hamlets, Stepney); Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Earl Percy, Kensington, S.) 1062

SLAVERY IN ZANZIBAR.—Question, Mr. Bayley (Derbyshire, Chesterfield); Answer, Earl Percy 1063

ANGLO-FRENCH AGREEMENT REGARDING MOROCCO.—Questions, Mr. Seymour Ormsby-Gore and Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis); Answer, Earl Percy .. 1064

CANADIAN IMMIGRATION FRAUDS.—Question, Mr. Charles Devlin; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Akers-Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's) 1064

INTEMPERANCE AND LUNACY.—Question, Mr. Hunter Craig (Lanarkshire, Govan); Answer, Mr. Akers-Doublas 1065

DEATHS FROM PHOSPHORUS POISONING.—Questions, Mr. Crooks and Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answer, Mr. Akers-Douglas .. 1065

SHOP HOURS BILL.—Question, Mr. Galloway; Answer, Mr. Akers-Douglas .. 1066

LONDON STREET TRAFFIC COMMISSION.—Question, Mr. Galloway; Answer, Mr. Akers-Douglas 1066

REFORMATORY SCHOOL TREATMENT.—Question, Mr. Galloway; Answer, Mr. Akers-Douglas 1067

WET DRILLING IN MINES.—Question, Mr. Markham; Answer, Mr. Akers-Douglas 1067

CARELESS SORTING AT THE GENERAL POST OFFICE.—Question, Sir Gilbert Parker (Gravesend); Answer, The Postmaster-General (Lord Stanley, Lancashire, Westhoughton) 1068

June 8.] Page

THE NATIONAL TELEPHONE COMPANY AND THE POST OFFICE.—Questions, Sir Frederick Banbury and Mr. Gibson Bowles; Answers, Lord Stanley .. 1068

TELEGRAPHIC COMMUNICATION WITH ICELAND AND THE FAROE ISLANDS.—Question, Mr. Doughty (Great Grimsby); Answer, Lord Stanley 1069

PENNY POSTAGE TO AUSTRALIA.—Question, Sir Gilbert Parker; Answer, Lord Stanley 1069

MAGAZINE POSTAGE RATES TO AND FROM THE COLONIES.—Question, Sir Gilbert Parker; Answer, Lord Stanley 1069

EXPENDITURE BY LIGHTHOUSE AUTHORITIES.—Question, Mr. Charles McArthur (Liverpool, Exchange); Answer, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Gerald Balfour, Leeds, Central) 1070

HARBOURS OF REFUGE ON THE CORNISH AND DEVONSHIRE COAST.—Question, Mr. Soares (Devonshire, Barnstaple); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 1071

LINCOLN AND SCAWBY LIGHT RAILWAY SCHEME.—Questions, Mr. Seymour Ormsby-Gore; Answers, Mr. Gerald Balfour 1071

ILLEGAL TRAWLING—SALE OF SEIZED TACKLE.—Questions, Mr. MacVeagh (Down, S.) and Mr. Cathcart Wason (Orkney and Shetland); Answers, Mr. Gerald-Balfour 1072

REGISTRARS OF DEATH AND THE PRESS.—Question, Mr. Mansfield (Lincolnshire, Spalding); Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Walter Long, Bristol, S.) 1073

DOG LICENCE PROSECUTIONS.—Questions, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Victor Cavendish, Derbyshire, W.) 1073

HUMANISED CALF LYMPH IN SCOTLAND.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. Graham Murray, Buteshire) 1074

LYMPH SUPPLIED TO THE CENTRAL VACCINE INSTITUTION FOR SCOTLAND.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 1074

CUMMERTREES PARISH SCHOOL.—Question, Mr. Maxwell (Dumfries-shire); Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 1075

TRINITY COLLEGE LANDS COMMISSION.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale (Armagh, Mid); Answer, The Attorney-General for Ireland (Mr. Atkinson, Londonderry, N.) 1076

LABOURERS (IRELAND) BILL.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, Mr. Atkinson 1076

BALLINASLOE ASYLUM MEDICAL STAFF.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, Mr. Atkinson 1076

DUBLIN VICTUALLERS' ASSESSMENT PROTEST.—Question, Mr. Field (Dublin, St. Patrick); Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.) 1076

June 8.] *Page*

MATERIALS TO BE USED IN BUILDING THE NEW COLLEGE OF SCIENCE, DUBLIN.—Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Mr. Victor Cavendish 1077

IRISH LEGISLATION.—Questions, Mr. John Redmond (Waterford); Answers, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 1077

CHINESE LABOUR IN RHODESIA.—Questions, Mr. Trevelyan (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland); Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1078

WAR OFFICE RECONSTITUTION COMMITTEE'S REPORT.—Questions, Mr. Chapman (Cheshire, Hyde) and Sir Charles Dilke; Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour .. 1079

VOLUNTEER VOTE.—Questions, Mr. Seymour Ormsby-Gore, Mr. McCrae (Edinburgh, E.), and Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs); Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1079

THE PENAL SERVITUDE BILL.—Questions, Mr. Lough, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman and Captain Norton; Answers, Mr. Akers-Douglas 1080

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.—Questions, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman and Dr. Farquharson (Aberdeenshire, W.); Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1082

CHINESE OVERSEERS—MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT REFUSED BY THE SPEAKER.—Questions, Mr. Herbert Samuel (Yorkshire, Cleveland), Mr. McKenna (Monmouthshire, N.), and Mr. Sydney Buxton (Tower Hamlets, Poplar); Answers, Mr. Speaker 1082

PUBLIC PETITIONS COMMITTEE.—Seventh Report brought up, and read; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 1083

FOREIGN SHIPS (APPLICATION OF STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS).—The Select Committee on Foreign Ships (Application of Statutory Requirements) was nominated of, Mr. Evelyn Cecil, Mr. Crean, Mr. Charles Devlin, Sir William Doxford, Mr. Munro Ferguson, Mr. Leverton Harris, Mr. John Johnson, Mr. Bonar Law, Mr. Charles McArthur, Mr. McKenna, Mr. David Morgan, Sir Albert Rollit, Mr. Runciman, Mr. Wolff, and Sir James Woodhouse.

Ordered, That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records.

Ordered, That Five be the quorum.—(*Sir A. Acland-Hood*) 1033

Tuberculosis (Animals) Compensation Bill.—The Select Committee on the Tuberculosis (Animals) Compensation Bill was nominated of, Mr. Barran, Dr. Farquharson, Mr. Field, Mr. Ernest Gray, Dr. Hutchinson, Captain Jessel, Mr. Kilbride, Mr. Grant Lawson, Mr. A. K. Lloyd, Mr. Price, Mr. Spear, Sir John Stirling-Maxwell, Sir Edward Strachey, Sir Mark Stewart, and Mr. Austin Taylor .. ..

Ordered, that the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records.

Ordered, That Five be the quorum.—(*Sir A. Acland-Hood*) 084

June 8.] *Page*

Aliens Bill.

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That the Order for Committee be read and discharged ; and that the Bill be committed to the Standing Committee on Law, etc."—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas*)

Mr. Trevelyan (*Yorkshire, W.R., Elland*) 1084
Mr. Lough (*Islington, W.*) 1088
Mr. Galloway (*Manchester, S.W.*) 1090
Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (*Stirling Burghs*) 1091
The Secretary of State for the Home Department (*Mr. Akers-Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's*) 1093
Mr. Asquith (*Fifeshire, E.*) 1096
Mr. Gibson Bowles (*Lynn Regis*) 1097
Mr. McKenna (*Monmouthshire, N.*) 1099
Mr. Edmund Robertson (*Dundee*) 1101
Mr. Runciman (*Dewsbury*) 1102
Mr. John Ellis (*Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe*) 1103
Lord Edmund Fitzmaurice (*Wiltshire, Cricklade*) 1104
Mr. Norman (*Wolverhampton, S.*) 1106
Mr. Tennant (*Berwickshire*) 1106
Mr. Stuart Samuel (*Tower Hamlets, Whitechapel*) 1107
Mr. Winston Churchill (*Oldham*) 1108
Mr. Moulton (*Cornwall, Launceston*) 1110
Mr. J. Chamberlain (*Birmingham, W.*) 1111
Sir Henry Fowler (*Wolverhampton, E.*) 1115
Mr. Dalziel (*Kirkcaldy Burghs*) 1117
Mr. Whitely (*Halifax*) 1120
Mr. J. A. Pease (*Essex, Saffron Walden*) 1121
Mr. Labouchere (*Northampton*) 1123
The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (*Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.*) 1124

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 277 : Noes, 187. (Division List No. 138).

ALIENS (EXPENSES).

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee).

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER, Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair].

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That it is expedient to authorise the payment, out of moneys to be provided by Parliament, of the salaries and remuneration of any persons employed, and of any Expenses incurred under any Act of the present session, to make provision with respect to the Immigration of Aliens, and other matters incidental thereto."—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas*).

Mr. Lough (*Islington, W.*) 1132
Mr. Whitley (*Halifax*) 1133
Mr. McKenna (*Monmouthshire, N.*) 1134
Mr. Sydney Buxton (*Tower Hamlets, Poplar*) 1135

Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis) 1136
Mr. Charles Hobhouse (Bristol, E.) 1137
Mr. Edmund Robertson (Dundee) 1138
The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Akers Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's) 1139
Mr. Asquith (Fifeshire, E.) 1140
Mr. Perks (Lincolnshire, Louth) 1140
Mr. McCrae (Edinburgh, E.) 1141
Mr. Runciman (Dewsbury) 1142
Mr. Levy (Leicestershire, Loughborough) 1143

Mr. MILVAIN rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put," but the Chairman withheld his assent, and declined then put that Question.

And, it being half-past Seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

ALIENS [EXPENSES].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Motion made, and Question again proposed, "That it is expedient to authorise the payment, out of moneys to be provided by Parliament, of the salaries and remuneration of any persons employed and of any Expenses incurred under any Act of the present session, to make provision with respect to the Immigration of Aliens, and other matters incidental thereto.—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) .. ..

Mr. Levy 1145
Sir Francis Powell (Wigan) 1148
Mr. Munro Ferguson (Leith Burghs) 1149
Mr. Dalziel (Kirkcaldy Burghs) 1150
The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Walter Long, Bristol, S.) 1152
Sir Walter Foster (Derbyshire, Ilkeston) 1153
Mr. Lloyd-George (Carnarvon Boroughs) 1152

Amendment proposed—

"At the end of the Question, to add the words, 'but not exceeding in any one year five thousand pounds.'"—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

Mr. Whitley 1157
Mr. Sydney Buxton 1157
Sir Henry Fowler (Wolverhampton, E.) 1158
Mr. Akers Douglas 1159

June 8.] Page

Mr. SECRETARY AKERS-DOUGLAS rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 179 ; Noes, 123. Division List, No. 139.).

Question put accordingly, "That those words be there added.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 133 ; Noes, 187. (Division List No. 140.)

Whereupon Mr. SECRETARY AKERS-DOUGLAS claimed, "That the main Question be now put.

Main Question put accordingly.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 192 ; Noes, 140. (Division List No. 141.)

Resolved that it is expedient to authorise the payment, out of moneys to be provided by Parliament, of the salaries and remuneration of any persons employed and of any Expenses incurred under any Act of the present session, to make provision with respect to the Immigration of Aliens, and other matters incidental thereto.

Question put, "That the Chairman do report this Resolution to the House."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 192 ; Noes, 142. (Division List No. 142.)

Resolution to be reported upon Monday next.

Licensing Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 1 :—

Mr. Griffith Boscawen (*Kent, Tunbridge*) 1173

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 5, to leave out the words 'an on,' and insert the word 'a'.—(*Mr. Griffith Boscawen.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'an on' stand part of the clause."

Mr. Cripps (Lancashire, Stretford) 1175
Sir Robert Reid (Dumfries Burghs) 1175
Mr. Corbett (Glasgow, Tradeston) 1176
The Solicitor-General (Sir Robert Finlay, Inverness Burghs) 1177
Mr. Whittaker (Yorkshire W.R., Spen Valley) 1178

And, it being Midnight, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress ; to sit again upon Monday next.

Home Industries Bill.

Ordered for Second Reading read, and discharged 1180

Bill withdrawn.

Adjourned at four minutes after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS: THURSDAY, 9TH JUNE, 1904.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with :—

Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 2) [H.L.] ; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 4) [H.L.] ; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 5) [H.L.] ; Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 1) [H.L.] ; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 5) ; Loch Leven Water Power.

Also the Certificates that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with :—

Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway (Various Powers) ; Brymbo Water ; Surrey Commercial Dock.

And also the Certificate that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have not been complied with :—

Strabane, Raphoe, and Convoy Railway.

The same were ordered to lie on the Table 1181

Charing Cross, Euston, and Hampstead Railway Bill.—A witness ordered to attend the Select Committee 1181

Tottenham Improvement Bill.—Strabane, Raphoe, and Convoy Railway Bill. Examiner's Certificates of non-compliance with the Standing Orders referred to the Standing Orders Committee on Monday next 1181

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [H.L.].—Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Five Lords appointed a Select Committee on the Manchester Corporation Tramways Bill [H.L.] and other Bills do form the Select Committee for the consideration of the Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [H.L.]. Read, and agreed to: All petitions referred to the Committee, with leave to the petitioners praying to be heard by counsel against the Bill to be heard as desired, as also counsel for the Bill 1181

Canal Rates and Charges (Regents Canal) Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]; Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [H.L.]. Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Five Lords appointed a Select Committee on the Oakengates, Dawley, and District Joint Water Board Bill [H.L.] and other Bills do form the Select Committee for the consideration of the Canal Rates and Charges (Regents Canal) Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.] and the Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [H.L.]. Read, and agreed to: All petitions referred to the Committee, with leave to the petitioners praying to be heard by counsel against the Bills to be heard as desired, as also counsel for the Bills 1181

Great Central and Midland Joint Railways Bill.—Read 2^a, and committed 1182

Scarisbrick Estate (Amendment) Bill [H.L.].—Lord Tredegar's Supplemental Estate Bill [H.L.]; De Trafford Estate Bill [H.L.]. Read 2^a 1182

Newcastle and Gateshead Water Bill [H.L.].—Read 3^a, and passed, and sent to the Commons 1182

Liverpool and Wigan Churches Bill [H.L.].—Read 3^a. An Amendment made. Bill passed, and sent to the Commons 1182

Derwent Valley Water Board Bill [H.L.]; Belfast Corporation (Tramways) Bill [H.L.]. Read 3^a, and passed, and sent to the Commons 1182

Kirkby-in-Ashfield Urban District Gas Bill.—Read 3^a, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons 1182

Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [H.L.]; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill [H.L.]; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill [H.L.]; Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [H.L.]. To be read 2^a To-morrow 1182

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill; Local Government Provisional Order (Poor Law) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill. House in Committee (according to order). Bills reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived; and Bills to be read 3^a To-morrow 1182

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill.—House in Committee (according to order). An Amendment made. Standing Committee negatived. The Report of the Amendment to be received To-morrow 1183

June 9.] *Page*

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill [H.L.]. ; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill [H.L.] ; Doncaster Corporation Bill ; Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway (Steam Vessels) Bill ; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No.2) Bill [H.L.] ; Barnet District Gas and Water Bill. Report from the Committee of Selection, That the following Lords be proposed to the House to form the Select Committee for the consideration of the said Bills ; (viz.) :—

D. Northumberland (chairman),
D. Wellington,
L. Tenterden,
L. Emly,
L. Cranworth ;

agreed to ; and the said Lords appointed accordingly. The Committee to meet on Thursday next at Eleven o'clock ; and all petitions referred to the Committee, with leave to the petitioners praying to be heard by counsel against the Bills to be heard as desired, as also counsel for the Bills 1183

PETITION.

Supply of Electricity Bill [H.L.].—Petition for amendment of ; of Mayor, etc., of St. Pancras ; read, and ordered to lie on the Table 1183

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Education (Scotland).—Report by George Andrew, Esq., one of His Majesty's Inspectors of Schools in Scotland, on the Gemeindeschulen of Berlin and Charlottenburgh 1183

Africa, No. 7 (1904).—Further correspondence respecting the administration of the Independent State of the Congo (in continuation of "Africa, No. 1 (1904)") 1184

Board of Trade and Local Government Board.—Report of the Committee appointed to consider the position and duties of the Board of Trade and of the Local Government Board 1184

National Portrait Gallery.—Forty-seventh Annual Report of the Trustees of the National Portrait Gallery, 1903-1904 1184

Eastern Mail Service.—Report of the Committee on the Eastern Mail Service 1184

Meteorological Grant Committee.—Report of the Committee appointed to inquire into the administration by the Meteorological Council of the existing Parliamentary Grant ; together with minutes of evidence and appendices .. 1184

Navigation and Shipping.—Annual statement of navigation and shipping of the United Kingdom, for the year 1903.
Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 1184

Superannuation : Treasury Minutes—

Dated 25th May, 1904, declaring that George Hockett, artificer, Royal Small Arms Factory, Enfield, War Office, was appointed without a Civil Service certificate through inadvertence on the part of the head of his department.

Dated 2nd June, 1904, granting a retired allowance to Matthew Farrelly, examining officer, second class, Liverpool Customs, under Section 2 of the Superannuation Act, 1887 1184

Public Works (Ireland).—Treasury Minute, dated 3rd June, 1904, authorising the lease of a house and small yard attached at the landward end of the West Pier, Kingstown. 1184

National School Teachers (Ireland) Pension Fund.—Account of receipts and payments in respect of the capital and income of the above fund for the period to 31st December, 1903 1185

Harwich Harbour.—Abstract of accounts and of the receipts and expenditure of the Harwich Harbour Conservancy Board from the time of their incorporation down to and inclusive of the 31st March, 1904.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 1185

Universities of Oxford and Cambridge Act, 1877.—Statute made by the Governing Body of Trinity College, Oxford, on the 26th February, 1904, amending Statute VI. (Pension Fund) of the Statutes of the College. Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and to be printed. (No. 94.) 1185

Seamen's and Soldiers' False Characters Bill [h.l.].—House in Committee (according to order); Bill reported without Amendment; and re-committed to the Standing Committee 1185

Agricultural Produce and Railway Rates.

The Earl of Lichfield 1185
Lord Burghclere 1195
The President of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries (*The Earl of Onslow*) 1197

Military Manœuvres Act, 1897.—Moved, That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty, praying His Majesty to make the Order in Council under the Military Manœuvres Act, 1897, a draft of which was presented to this House on the 8th of March last.—(*The Viscount Hutchinson* (*E. Donoughmore*)).

Agreed to.

Ordered, That the said Address be presented to His Majesty by the Lords with White Staves. 1201

House adjourned at half-past Five o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: THURSDAY, 9th JUNE, 1904.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

The Chairman of Ways and Means.—The Clerk at the Table informed the House of the unavoidable absence of the Chairman of Ways and Means .. 1201

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Private Bills [Lords] (Standing Orders not Previously inquired into Complied with).—Mr. Speaker laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz. :—Newcastle-upon-Tyne Corporation Bill [Lords] Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time 1201

June 9.] *Page*

North Western Electricity and Power Gas Bill.—Read the third time and passed 1201

Skipton Water and Improvement Bill.—Read the third time and passed. [New Title] 1201

Dundee, Broughty Ferry, and District Tramways Order Confirmation Bill; Leith Burgh Order Confirmation Bill. Read a second time; to be considered upon Monday next 1201

Leigh Corporation Tramways Order Conrfimation Bill.—Read a second time 1202

Motherwell and Bellshill Railway (Abandonment) Order Confirmation Bill.—Read a second time; to be considered upon Monday next .. 1202

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.—That they have agreed to—Sheppy Gas Bill, without Amendment.

Colney Hatch Gas Bill; North Staffordshire Railway Bill; Gomersal Gas Bill, with Amendments.

Amendments to—Gosport Water Bill [Lords]; Metropolitan Railway Bill [Lords]; West Metropolitan Railway (Abandonment) Bill [Lords]; and Sawbridgeworth Gas Bill [Lords]; Liverpool and London and Globe Insurance Company Bill [Lords]; University of Leeds Bill [Lords]; Yorktown and Blackwater Gas Bill [Lords]; Chesterfield Corporation (Tramways and Improvements) Bill [Lords]; without Amendment.

That they have passed a Bill intituled,, "An Act for the suppression of Betting in Streets and other public places." [Street Betting Bill [Lords]].

Also a Bill, intituled, " An Act to confirm a Provisional Order made by the Board of Education, under the Education Acts, 1870 to 1903, to enable the council of the city and county borough of Birmingham to put into force the Land Clauses Acts." [Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (Birmingham) Bill [Lords]].

And, also, a Bill, intituled, " An Act for rendering valid certain Letters Patent granted to Richard Jaeger in respect of an invention for an improved process for the dry slaking of lime and apparatus therefore. [Richard Jaeger's Patent Bill [Lords]]. 1202

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (Birmingham) Bill [Lords]. Read the first time; Referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 224] 1202

Richard Jaeger's Patent Bill [Lords]. Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills 1202

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition from Inverness, for alteration; to lie upon the Table 1203

LICENSING BILL.—Petitions against; from Glossop; Middleton-in-Teesdale; Love's Beechburn; Stanley Colliery; Callington; Blunts; Witton Junction; Broughton Park; Machen; Tideford; Kidwelly; Whitland; Stroud;

Chalford ; Fir Tree ; St. George's-in-the-East ; Glasgow (five) ; Trawdon ; Loughborough ; Northampton (two) ; Harwood-in-Teesdale ; Sevenoaks (two) ; Nuneaton ; Derby ; Newquay (two) ; Rochester ; Western Favell ; Little Houghton ; Great Billing ; Ecton ; Hertford ; North Kensington ; Carhampton ; Acocks Green ; Oldham ; Bridlington ; Enfield ; Plymouth ; Hanfield ; Hylton Colliery ; North Shields (four) ; Ecclesall (two) ; Middle Marsh ; Radcliffe ; Burnham ; Garton ; Silloth ; Bridport ; Botton ; Bolton (two) ; Dunster ; Ayr ; Oban ; South Ayr ; Lintz Colliery ; Burnopfield ; Winlaton ; Fellside ; Bridlington Quay ; Brindley Ford ; Wheddon Cross ; Greenock ; West Dorset ; Paisley ; Putney ; Winsford ; Mytholmroyd ; Methley ; Liverpool ; Charlesworth ; Wimblington ; Fairburn ; Hightown ; Kidderminster ; Haughton Green ; Shetland ; Newton Toney ; Whiteparish ; West Grimstead ; Blaydon-on-Tyne ; Eccles ; Allonby ; Warwick Bridge ; Clayton ; Stocksbridge ; Minehead ; Luton (two) ; Harpenden ; Abergele ; Colwyn Bay (two) ; Llandyrnog ; Macclesfield (two) ; Great Yarmouth ; Bardwell ; Ardwick ; Ford ; Goldenhill ; Congleton ; Henshaw ; Prudhoe Station ; Nether Hallam ; Chatteris ; Bilston ; Daw Bank ; Maidstone (two) ; Pilling ; Birmingham (three) ; Brightside ; Hebden Bridge (three) ; Wrexham (two) ; Flamstead ; Kinsbourne Green ; Markyate ; Hatfield ; Chaul End ; Huddersfield ; Dulwich ; Weaste ; Saint Pancras ; Barnard Castle ; Pontypridd ; Crigglestone ; Coundon Grange ; Quernmore ; Westhoughton ; Oxford Place ; Watton ; Little Cressingham ; Saham Toney ; Stirlingshire ; Bideford (two) ; Carmarthen ; Borough ; Walker ; Brandon ; Chertsey ; Greenwich ; Ludlow ; Barningham ; Stanford ; Fenton ; Brentwood ; Woodland ; Chorley ; Dalton ; Moor ; Stainton ; Bowes ; Brailsford ; Ashbourne ; Kirkcaldy ; Longsight ; Burntisland ; Cromer ; Pegswood ; Tarbets ; Maindee ; Ilford ; Rothwell ; Leeds ; Horsforth (two) ; Outwood ; Lower Altofts ; Loscoe ; Blaenplwyf ; Ystumtuen ; North Seaton ; Watford ; Garforth ; Skelmanthorpe ; Cwmbrwyne ; Bridge of Earn ; Sunderland ; Kinghorn ; Manchester ; Mingoose St. Agnes ; Gwennap ; Whitwood ; North Bitchburn ; Crosby Garrett ; Gaisgill ; Kirby Stephen ; Stokesley ; Rodley ; Parwich ; Loddon ; Gildersome ; Farsley ; St. Helens (two) ; Prudhoe ; Barnsley (two) ; Pallion ; and Halton and Crossgates ; to lie upon the Table 1203

LICENSING BILL.—Petition from Canterbury, for alteration ; to lie upon the Table 1204

TRAWLERS' CERTIFICATES SUSPENSION BILL.—Petition from Inverness, in favour ; to lie upon the Table 1204

VALUATION BILL.—Petitions for alteration ; from Haltwhistle ; Bromsgrove ; Turton ; and Westminster ; to lie upon the Table 1204

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

EAST INDIA (NATURAL FERTILISERS).—Return presented, relative thereto [Address 7th June ; *Mr. Emmott*] ; to lie upon the Table 1204

METEOROLOGICAL GRANT (COMMITTEE).—Copy presented, of Report of the Committee appointed to inquire into the administration by the Meteorological Council of the existing Parliamentary Grant, together with Minutes of Evidence and Appendices [by Command] ; to lie upon the Table . .. 1204

June 9.] *Page*

ELECTRIC LIGHTING ACTS, 1882 AND 1888.—Copy presented, of Special Reports by the Board of Trade under Section (1) of The Electric Lighting Act, 1888 respecting—(1) Bothwell Electric Lighting Order, 1904; (2) Houghton-le-Spring and District Electric Lighting Order, 1904; (3) Kilpatrick Electric Lighting Order, 1904; (4) Kingswood Electric Lighting Order, 1904; (5) Northampton and District Electric Lighting Order, 1904; (6) Shettleston Electric Lghting Order, 1904 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1204

IRISH LAND ACT, 1903.—Return ordered, "of Estates purchased by the Congested Districts Board for Ireland in respect of the period of six months ended the 30th day of April, 1904, for the purposes of re-sale to tenants and the enlargement of holdings, in the following form:—(1) County; (2) Number of estates; (3) Number of holdings under permanent tenancies; (4) Acreage of lands under permanent tenancies and temporary lettings (*a*) tenanted, (*b*) untenanted, (*c*) total; (5) Purchase money; (6) Gross rental."—(*Mr. Wyndham*) 1205

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

THE NUMBER OF MEN EMPLOYED IN BUILDING THE VICTORIA AND ALBERT MUSEUM.—Question, Sir Henry Fowler (Wolverhampton, E.); Answer, Lord Balcarres 1205

THE NEW SILVER COINAGE.—Question, Mr. Bayley (Derbyshire, Chesterfield); Answer, Mr. Victor Cavendish 1205

RELIGIOUS OBSERVANCE IN VOLUNTARY SCHOOLS.—Question, Mr. Halsey (Hertfordshire, Watford); Answer, Sir William Anson 1206

SANITARY CONDITION OF POST OFFICE AT 10, OXFORD STREET.—Mr. Bayley (Derbyshire, Chesterfield); Answer, Lord Stanley 1206

CLONES POST OFFICE.—Question, Mr. M'Kean (Monaghan, S.); Answer, Lord Stanley 1207

POST OFFICE GUIDE—LIST OF OFFICES WITH SUNDAY DESPATCH AND DELIVERY. Question, Mr. Nussey (Pontefract); Answer, Lord Stanley 1207

CHINESE SEAMEN ON BRITISH STEAMSHIP "TURBO."—Question, Mr. Joyce (Limerick); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 1208

REFUSED LICENCES.—Question, Mr. Alfred Davies (Carmarthen Boroughs); Answer, Mr. Akers Douglas 1209

PERTH QUARTER SESSIONS—SUMMONING OF JUSTICES.—Question, Mr. Buchanan (Perthshire, E.); Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 1209

ADMIRALTY YACHT "ENCHANTRESS"—Question, Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis); Answer, Mr. Pretyman 1210

EMPLOYMENT OF SOLICITORS FOR VACCINATION PROSECUTIONS IN LAMBETH.—Question, Mr. Corrie Grant (Warwickshire, Rugby); Answer Mr. Walter Long 1210

ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURE UNDER THE INDIAN COUNCILS BILL.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 1210

June 9.] Page

POLITICAL EFFECTS OF ENGLISH EDUCATION IN INDIA.—Question, Mr. Humphreys-Owen (Montgomeryshire); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 1211

ESTATE OF THE DEWAR OF DHAR.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. Brodrick 1211

TERMS OF LOANS FOR IRISH LABOURERS' COTTAGES.—Question, Mr. Clancy (Dublin County, N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1212

WAGES OF CENTRAL AFRICAN NATIVES IN TRANSVAAL MINES.—Question, Sir John Gorst (Cambridge University); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 1212

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

THE SINKING OF THE "THISTLE."—Questions, Sir John Leng (Dundee), and Captain Donelan (Cork County, E.); Answers, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Pretyman, Suffolk, Woodbridge) 1213

LORD ROBERTS' SALARY.—Questions, Mr. Markham (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield), and Mr. Seymour Ormsby-Gore (Lincolnshire, Gainsborough); Answers, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Arnold-Forster, Belfast, W.) .. 1214

3RD NORTH STAFFORDSHIRE REGIMENT—CASE OF WILLIAM VERNON.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1215

CRIMEAN PENSIONERS.—Question, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1215

CHINESE LABOUR IN THE TRANSVAAL MINES—POWERS OF CHINESE CONSUL.—Question, Mr. J. A. Pease (Essex, Saffron Walden); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Lyttelton, Warwick and Leamington) .. 1215

CHINESE LABOUR IN THE TRANSVAAL.—Questions, Mr. Seymour Ormsby-Gore, Mr. Sydney Buxton (Tower Hamlets, Poplar), Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs), Mr. Cathcart Wason (Orkney and Shetland), Mr. Markham, Mr. Joseph Walton (Derbyshire, Chesterfield); Answers, Mr. Lyttelton 1216

TRANSVAAL FINANCES.—Question, Mr. Sydney Buxton; Answers, Mr. Lyttelton 1218

TRANSVAAL DYNAMITE DUTIES.—Questions, Mr. Markham, Answers, Mr. Lyttelton 1219

TRANSVAAL GOLD MINE PROFIT TAX.—Question, Mr. Whitley (Halifax); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 1220

FINANCE OF THE NEW COLONIES.—Question, Mr. Whitley; Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 1220

NO BRITISH MISSION TO KABUL.—Question, Mr. Boland (Kerry, S.); Answer, The Secretary of State for India (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford) 1220

NEW INDIAN PROVINCE ADMINISTRATORS.—Question, Mr Schwann (Manchester, N.); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 1221

MR. TILAK'S CASE.—Question, Mr. Schwann; Answer, Mr. Brodrick 1221

June 9.] *Page*

East Africa—Alienation of Territory.—Questions, Mr. Cathcart Wason; Answers, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Earl Percy, Kensington, S.) 1222

Transvaal War Contribution.—Question, Mr. Whitley; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.) .. 1222

Tests of High Explosives.—Question, Mr. Markham; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Akers Douglas, Kent, St. Augustines) 1223

Treatment of Habitual Criminals.—Question, Mr. Dalziel (Kirkcaldy Burghs) Answer, Mr. Akers Douglas 1224

Irish Railway Servants and Benefit Societies.—Question, Mr. Lundon (Limerick, E.); Answer, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Gerald Balfour, Leeds, Central) .. .. — 1224

Grant to the Meteorological Council.—Question, Mr. Dalziel; Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Victor Cavendish, Derbyshire, W.) 1225

Motor Car Regulations.—Question, Mr. Gardner (Berkshire, Wokingham); Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Walter Long, Bristol, S.) 1225

Motors in the Parks.—Questions, Mr. Cathcart Wason, and Dr. Farquharson (Aberdeenshire, W.); Answers, Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley) .. 1225

Astley Abbotts (Shropshire) Postal Arrangements.—Question, Mr. Hunt (Shropshire, Ludlow); Answer, The Postmaster General (Lord Stanley, Lancashire, Westhoughton) 1226

Sunday Pay of Adult Messengers in Belfast Post Office.—Question. Mr. Sloan; Answer, Lord Stanley 1226

Use of Public Elementary Schools for Political Meetings.—Question, Mr. Hunt; Answer, The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education (Sir William Anson, Oxford University) 1227

Irish National School Plans.—Question, Mr. Boland; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 1227

Valentia Ferry.—Question, Mr. Boland; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1227

Irish Outdoor Relief Regulations.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh (Down, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1228

French Fishing Boats in the Kenmare River.—Questions, Mr. Boland and Mr. MacVeagh; Answers, Mr. Wyndham 1228

Blocking Motions.—Questions, Mr. J. A. Pease, Mr. Pirie (Aberdeen, N.) Mr. J. F. Hope (Sheffield Brightside) Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Major Seely (Isle of Wight) and Mr. MacVeagh; Answers, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 1229

Trade Disputes Bill.—Question, Mr. Lundon; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour .. 1232

Licensing Bill.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour .. 1233

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.—Questions, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, and Mr. Whitley; Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1233

NEW WRIT.—New writ for the Borough of Devonport, in the room of John Lockie, esquire (Chiltern Hundreds).—(*Sir A. Acland-Hood.*) 1234

Registration of Clubs (Ireland) Bill.

Reported, with Amendments, from the Standing Committee on Trade, etc.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 204.]

Minutes of the Proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed. [No. 204.]

Bill, as amended (in the Standing Committee), to be taken into consideration upon Friday, 17th June, and to be printed. [Bill 223.] 1234

Weights and Measures (Metric System) Bill [Lords].—Read the first time; to be read a second time upon Wednesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 225.] 1234

NEW BILLS.

Port Sanitary Authorities Expenses Bill.—"To remove doubts as to the legality of certain payments by Port Sanitary Authorities," presented by Mr. Plummer, supported by Sir Joseph Dimsdale, Sir James Joicey, Sir Henry Seymour King, Mr. William Lawrence, Mr. Herbert Lewis, Mr. MacIver, Sir Edward Reed, Mr. Robson, Sir John Barrington Simeon, Mr. Charles Wilson, and Mr. Yerburgh; to be read a second time upon Thursday next, and to be printed. [Bill 226.] 1235

Carriers Act (1830) Amendment Bill.—"To amend the Carriers Act, 1830," presented by Mr. Bill; supported by Mr. Arthur Heath, Mr. Bond, Mr. Strutt, and Mr. Trevelyan; to be read a second time upon Thursday, 23rd June, and to be printed. [Bill 227.] 1235

Public Entertainment Bill.—"To amend the Law relating to Public Entertainment," presented by Captain Jessel; supported by Mr. William Frederick Smith, Sir George Fardell, Sir Robert Mowbray, Dr. Macnamara, Major Jameson, Mr. T. P. O'Connor, Mr. Crooks, and Mr. Shackleton; to be read a second time upon Monday, 20th June, and to be printed. [Bill 228] 1235

Street Traffic (Regulation) Bill.—"To provide for the Regulation of Traffic in Streets," presented by Mr. Shackleton; supported by Mr. Bell, Mr. Crooks, and Mr. Henderson; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 22nd June, and to be printed. [Bill 229] 1235

SUPPLY [12TH ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. JEFFREYS (Hampshire, N.) in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1904–5.—CLASS II.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That a sum not exceeding £35,771, be granted to His Majesty to complete the sum necessary to defray the

Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Department of His Majesty's Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs."

Sir Charles Dilke (*Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean*) 1236
Mr. Austin Taylor (*Liverpool, East Toxteth*) 1247
Mr. Emmott (*Oldham*) 1251
Sir John Gorst (*Cambridge University*) 1257
Mr. Herbert Samuel (*Yorkshire, Cleveland*) 1261
Lord Edmund Fitzmaurice (*Wiltshire, Cricklade*) 1267
The Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (*Earl Percy, Kensington S.*) 1272
Sir Edward Grey (*Northumberland, Berwick*) 1285
Mr. Gibson Bowles (*Lynn Regis*) 1290
Mr. Cathcart Wason (*Orkney and Sheltand*) 1294

And it being half-past Seven of the clock the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

London County Council (Tramways and Improvements) Bill (By Order).

As amended, considered.
Clause (For preventing obstruction at Westminster Bridge).

> " Whereas it has been arranged between the Council and the Commissioner of Police that on and after the first day of January, nineteen hundred and five, the Council shall not run any car on that portion of the tramway in Westminster Bridge Road which lies to the west of its junction with York Road on such days and at such hours as the Commissioner of Police may from time to time direct. Such arrangement is hereby confirmed.
>
> " Provided always that if any question shall arise between the Council and the Commissioner as to whether any such direction is reasonable such question shall be determined by the Secretary of State for the Home Department."—(*Mr. Cochrane.*)

Brought up and read the first time.

Motion made and Question proposed " That the clause be now read a second time."

Dr. Macnamara (*Camberwell, N.*) 1297
Captain Jessel (*St. Pancras, S.*) 1298
Mr. John Burns (*Battersea*) 1299
The Under-Secretary of State for the Home Department (*Mr. Cochrane, Ayrshire, N.*) 1300

Question put and agreed to

Clause added to the Bill.

Mr. Remnant (Finsbury, Holborn) .. 1302
Mr. Bull (Hammersmith) .. 1303

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 7, line 17, to leave out the words in lines 17 to 24 inclusive."—(*Mr. Remnant.*)

Question proposed "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Compton Rickett (Scarborough) .. 1303
Captain Jessel .. 1305
Mr. Hudson (Hertfordshire, Hitchen) .. 1307
Mr. John Burns .. 1307
Mr. Ernest Gray (West Ham, N.) .. 1311
Mr. Pemberton (Sunderland) .. 1312
Mr. John Dewar (Inverness) .. 1312
Mr. Cremer (Shoreditch, Haggerston) .. 1113

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 106 ; Noes, 135. (Division List No. 143.)

Bill to be read the third time.

SUPPLY [12TH ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[MR. JEFFREYS (Hampshire, N.) in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1904-5.—CLASS II.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £35,771, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Department of His Majesty's Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs."

Mr. Bryce (Aberdeen, S.) .. 1316
Mr. Louis Sinclair (Essex, Romford) .. 1318
Earl Percy .. 1319
Mr. John Campbell (Armagh, S.) .. 1324

And, it being Midnight, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress ; to sit again upon Monday next.

MILITARY MANŒUVRES (ORDER IN COUNCIL).—Resolved, That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty, praying His Majesty to make the Order in Council under the Military Manœuvres Act, 1897, a draft of which was presented to this House on the 9th day of March last.—(*Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*)

To be presented by Privy Councillors and Members of His Majesty's Household 1324

Adjourned at four Minutes after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS: FRIDAY, 10TH JUNE, 1904.

SAT FIRST.—The Lord Oxenfoord (*E. Stair*)—Sat first in Parliament after the death of his father 1325

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House that the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificate from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with :—

London and India Docks Company. The same was ordered to lie on the Table 1325

Manchester Ship Canal Bill [H.L.].—The King's consent signified ; and Bill reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments 1325

Stretford Urban District Council Bill [H.L.].—Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments 1325

King's College Hospital Bill [H.L.] ; Wolverhampton Corporation Bill.—Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments 1325

Great Northern Railway Bill ; Midland Railway Bill.—Reported, with Amendments 1325

London and North-Western Railway Bill.—Report from the Select Committee, That the Committee had not proceeded with the consideration of the Bill, no parties having appeared in opposition thereto, read; and ordered to lie on the Table. The orders made on the 28th of April and 17th of May last discharged, and Bill committed 1325

Lothians Electric Power Bill [H.L.].—Read 3ª, and passed, and sent to the Commons 1325

Littlestone-on-Sea and District Water Bill ; Brixham Gas Bill ; Acton Improvement Bill. Read 3ª, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons 1325

Torquay Tramways Bill ; Charing Cross, Euston, and Hampstead Railway Bill ; Baker Street and Waterloo Railway Bill ; Soothill Nether Urban District Tramways Bill ; Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [H.L.]. Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Lord Seaton be proposed to the House as a member of the Select Committee on the said Bills in the place of the Lord Deramore ; read, and agreed to 1326

June 10.] *Page*

Oakengates, Dawley, and District Joint Water Board Bill [H.L.]; Humber Commercial Railway and Dock Bill; Great Central Railway Bill; Canal Rates and Charges (Regent's Canal) Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]; Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [H.L.]. Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Lord Monson be proposed to the House as a member of the Select Committee on the said Bills in the place of the Marquess of Exeter; read, and agreed to 1326

North-Western Electricity and Power Gas Bill; Skipton Water and Improvement Bill. Brought from the Commons; read 1ª; and referred to the Examiners 1326

Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [H.L.]. Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill [H.L.]; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill [H.L.]; Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [H.L.]. Read 2ª (according to order) 1326

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill; Local Government Provisional Order (Poor Law) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill. Read 3ª (according to order), and passed .. — 1326

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No 1) Bill.—Amendment reported (according to order), and Bill to be read 3ª on Monday next 1326

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRADE REPORTS.—

I. Annual Series—No. 3180. Denmark. No. 3181. France (Cochin China). No. 3182. Persia (the Persian Gulf) 1326

II. Miscellaneous Series. No. 612. Customs Tariff of Belgium .. 1327

ELECTRIC LIGHTING ACTS, 1882 AND 1888. Special Reports by the Board of Trade under Section 1 of the Electric Lighting Act, 1888 1327

DUBLIN HOSPITALS.—Forty-sixth Report of the Board of Superintendence, with appendices, for the year 1903–4.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 1327

MERCHANT SEAMEN'S FUND.—Account of the receipts and expenditure under the Seamen's Fund Winding-up Act, from 1st January to 31st December, 1903 1327

SUPERANNUATION.—Treasury minute, dated 26th May, 1904, declaring that Thomas Tootell, letter carrier, Post Office, was appointed without a Civil Service certificate through inadvertence on the part of the head of his Department.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 1327

NEW BILLS.

Reserve Forces Bill [H.L.] (No. 95).—A Bill to amend the law relating to the Reserve Forces. And 1327

Naval and Military Medals Bill [H.L.] (No. 96).—A Bill to regulate and restrict the wearing of Naval and Military Medals and Decorations—Were presented by the Viscount Hutchinson (*E. Donoughmore*); read 1ª; to be printed; and to be read 2ª on Tuesday next 1327

Merchant Shipping Act, 1894, Amendment Bill [H.L.].—A Bill to amend the Merchant Shipping Act, 1894—Was presented by the Lord Muskerry; read 1ª; and to be printed. (No. 97.) 1327

CROWN AGENTS OF THE COLONIES.

The Earl of Portsmouth 1328

Moved, "That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the system by which the Crown Agents of the Colonies are paid, and their methods of transacting the duties attaching to their office."—(*The Earl of Portsmouth.*)

Earl Grey 1338
The Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies (*The Duke of Marlborough*) 1346
The Marquis of Ripon 1357
The President of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries (*The Earl of Onslow*) 1361

On Question, resolved in the negative.

THE YEOMANRY.

The Marquess of Winchester 1364
The Under-Secretary of State for War (*The Earl of Donoughmore*) .. 1364

House adjourned at ten minutes past Seven o'clock, to Monday next, a quarter before Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: FRIDAY, 10TH JUNE, 1904.

The House met at Twelve of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS (STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE THERETO COMPLIED WITH).—MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz.:—Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Provisional Order Bill. Ordered that the Bill be read a second time upon Monday next 1364

St. Marylebone Electric Lighting Bill.—Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to 1365

Swindon Corporation Bill.—Reported, with Amendments, from the Police and Sanitary Committee [Section B]; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 1365

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 14) Bill.—Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table .. ..

Bill to be read the third time upon Monday next 1365

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 15) Bill.—Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time upon Monday next 1365

Educational Board Provisional Order (Swansea) Bill.—Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Order confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time upon Monday next 1365

Marylebone Chapels (St. James's, Westmoreland Street) Bill [LORDS]; South Staffordshire Mines Drainage Bill [Lords]. Reported, without Amendment; Reports to lie upon the Table.

Bills to be read the third time 1365

St. Bartholomew's Hospital Bill [LORDS].—Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table 1365

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.—Second Report brought up and read; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 207.] 1365

Leyton Urban District Council Bill.—Reported, with Amendments, from the Police and Sanitary Committee [Section A]; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 1365

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition from Stirling and Dunblane, for alteration; to lie upon the Table 1366

HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES, ETC., BILL.—Petition fromBarrow-in-Furness, against; to lie upon the Table 1376

LICENSING BILL.—Petitions against; from Old Town; Cragg; Heptonstall; Hebden Bridge; Glasgow; Sheffield (four); Darlington; Salford (two); Batley; Kilmarnock; North Ormesby; Leeds (thirteen); Armley (three); North Cowton; Christchurch; Kelloe; Charlestown; Foleshill; Bolton (two); Macclesfield; Dewsbury; St. Pancras Borough Council; Cheetwood (two); Runcorn; Davenham; Barnton; Northwich (four); Plumbley; Sproston; Goostrey; Church Hulme; Weaverham; Over; Hartford; Comberbach; Winsford (two); Acton; Middlewich; Great Budworth; Bartington; Sandiway; Norley; Pickmere; Wharton Works; Little Budworth; Lostock Graham; Kensal New Town; Paddington (three); Queen's Park; West London (three); Harrow Road; Catherine's Park; Leinster Square; St. John's Wood; North Mundham; Woodbridge; Ventnor; Cubbington; Huntpill; Highbridge; Coulting; Westonzoyland; Bridgwater; Spaxton; Combwich; Middlezoy; Lower Boddington; Crosshill; Woodford Green; Paddock Wood; West Wiltshire; Grenoside; Harbury; Burbage; Laddingford; Worsthorne; Haverton Hill; Burnley; Openshaw; Ollerton; Bedminister; Chacombe; Conway; Williamscott; Mobberley; Peterhead; Manchester (two); Perth; Thirsk and Sowerby; Orrell; Mereclough; Clitheroe; Pembroke; Holbeck (two); Bloxham; East Peckham; Stoke Newington; Sapcote; Cheshire; Alderley Edge; Pontefract; Goose Green; Dalston; Leamington (two); Wakefield (three); Cropredy; Knutsford; Alverthorpe; Garaton; Middleton; Festiniog (three); Bradford (two); Withington; Kenilworth; Bath; Perry Barr; Clutton; Beeston Hill; Wortley; Bramley;

Putney; Hanley; Bristol (three); Llaintainam; Plymouth; Pwllheli; Aberdaron; Snelson; Adderbury; Pentre Halkin; Brenchley; Chiddingstone Hoath; Greenfield; Walthamstow (three); Hedon; Great Bentley; Regent's Park; Buckley; Lowdham; Lloc; Edgworth; Llanelly; Bishopteignton; High Brooms; Teignmouth; Empingham; Shaldon; Widcombe; Dawlish; Gateshead; Flint (two); Pendreg; Red Hill; Rawtenstall; Buckland; South Hants; Portsmouth; Mold; Leeswood; Great Clacton; Newcastle-on-Tyne; Kempston; Cleethorpes; Bedford; New Wortley; Tonbridge; Trawsfynydd; Earlestown (two); Tunbridge Wells; Droylsden (three); Islington; Rhiw; Hooley Hill; Dean; Crowborough; Helmshore; Barwell; Hinckley; Swannington; Plumpton; East Holywell; West Ealing (two); Ealing (two); Durham Hill; Bulwell; Nottingham; Stromness; Christleton; Cardiff (six); Derby; Halifax (two); Llainlar; Woburn Green; Ovenden; Wheatley; Illingworth; Akroyden; Middlesbrough (five); Penygarnedd; Marlow; Kidsgrove; Billy Row; Breedon-on-the-Hill; Leighton Buzzard; Grays; Keswick; Melksham; Halton; Silverdale; Sittingbourne; Whitwick; Bredgar; Fenny Stratford; Queensbury; Hawkhurst; Cosely; Bradshawgate; Willington; Coalville; Rhydfelen; Bilston; Penrith; Devizes; Thringstone; Berriew; Holland Park Avenue; Southwark; Fletchertown; Llanfyllin; Nantfyllon; Llansantfraid; Brithdir; Stargate; Woodsetton; Tipton; Crawcrook; Stoke-upon-Trent; Harpenden (three); Finchley; Gorton; Huby; Stony Stratford; Crumpsall; Southport (four); Clayton West; Leicester; Wing; Thorpe Fen Dykes; Walworth; West Hartlepool (nineteen); Redland; Ludham; Openshaw (two); Tottenham; High Spen; Govanhill; Pollokshields; Skegness; Selly Oak; Meagar; Wainfleet; Bradford; Newton Heath (two); Alderley Edge; Lichfield; Bradfield; Acle; Fleggburgh; West Caister; Friskney; Stow Hill; Lincoln (three); and Longsight; to lie upon the Table 1367

LICENSING BILL.—Petitions for alteration; from Bedminister Down; Kettering; Enfield (two); Bedford; Chiswick; Clifton; Tottenham; Cotham; and Winchester; to lie upon the Table 1367

PORT OF LONDON BILL.—Petition from Wandsworth, against; to lie upon the Table 1368

VALUATION BILL.—Petitions against; from Bridlington; and City of London; to lie upon the Table 1368

VALUATION BILL.—Petitons for alteration; from Maidstone; Carlisle; and Eccleshall; to lie upon the Table 1368

VALUATION BILL.—Petition from Liverpool, in favour; to lie upon the Table .. 1368

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

EAST INDIA (NATURAL FERTILISERS).—Return [presented 9th June] to be printed. [No. 206.] 1368

SOUTH AFRICAN MINES (MORTALITY).—Return presented, relative thereto [Address 24th February; *Mr. Trevelyan*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 205.] 1368

DUBLIN HOSPITALS.—Copy presented, of forty-sixth Report of the Board of Superintendence, with Appendices, for the year 1903–4 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1368

June 10.] *Page*

TRADE REPORTS (MISCELLANEOUS SERIES).—Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Miscellaneous Series, No. 612 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1368

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).—Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3180 and 3181 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1368

MERCHANT SEAMEN'S FUND.—Account presented, of the Receipts and Expenditure under the Seamen's Fund Winding-up Act from 1st January to 31st December, 1903 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 1368

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

PAYMENTS FOR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL EXPENSES.—Question Sir James Rankin (Herefordshire, Leominster); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 1369

TIBET EXPEDITION AND DUM DUM BULLETS.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill (Donegal, S.); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 1369

SIR ANTONY MCDONNELL'S SALARY.—Question, Mr. Charles Craig (Antrim, S.); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 1370

EVICTIONS ON THE TEENAN ESTATE.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1370

IRISH DISTRICT AND COUNTY COUNCIL OFFICIALS AND POLITICAL MEETINGS.—Question, Mr. Edward Mitchell; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1371

THE CAPE PARLIAMENT—CHINESE EXCLUSION BILL.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 1371

THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL OF INDIA.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, Mr. Brodrick 1372

MUSICAL COPYRIGHT BILL.

As amended (by the Standing Committee), considered.

Mr. Caldwell (*Lanarkshire, Mid*) 1372

A Clause (Seizure of pirated copies).

"It shall be lawful for any police constable, on the request in writing of the owner of the copyright, or of his agent thereto authorised in writing, and on production to such constable of a copy of the entry of such copyright in the book of registry, certified and impressed as aforesaid, and at the risk of such owner, to seize without warrant any pirated copies of such musical work which, within view of such constable, and in any public place or place to which the public have access on payment or otherwise, are being hawked or carried about for purposes constituting an offence under this Act, and to bring the same before a Court of summary jurisdiction for the purpose of its being determined, in accordance with the provisions hereinbefore contained, whether the same are or are not liable to forfeiture and destruction."—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Brought up, and read the first and second time, and added.

Another Clause (Repeal of Act).

"The Musical (Summary Proceedings) Copyright Act, 1902, is hereby repealed."—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Brought up, and read the first and second time, and added.

Another Clause (Definitions).

"'Musical copyright' means the exclusive right of the owner of such copyright, under the Copyright Acts in force for the time being, to do or to authorise another person to do all or any of the following things of a musical work:—

"(1) To make copies, by writing or otherwise, of such musical work;

"(2) To abridge such musical work;

"(3) To make any new adaptation, arrangement, or setting of such musical work, or of the melody thereof, in any notation or system.

"'Musical work' means any combination of melody and harmony, or either of them, printed, reduced to writing, or otherwise graphically produced or reproduced.

"'Pirated musical work' means any musical work written, printed, or otherwise reproduced, without the consent lawfully given by the owner of the copyright in such musical work.

"The expression 'plates' includes any stereotype or other plates, stones, or matrixes or negatives used for the purpose of printing or reproducing copies of any pirated musical work."—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Brought up, and read the first and second time, and added.

Another Clause (Limitation of Act).

"This Act shall not apply to any musical copyright which is not registered in terms of The Copyright Act, 1842, and no proceedings shall be competent in respect of any offence committed prior to such registration."—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Brought up, and read the first and second time, and added.

Mr. Humphreys-Owen (*Montgomeryshire*) 1374
Mr. Caldwell 1375

Another Clause (Registration by owner of copyright).

"The owner of the copyright, or his assignee, of every musical work, whether published before or after the commencement of this Act, shall, where not already done, within one month from the commencement of this Act, or within one month of the first publication of the musical work in the United Kingdom, whichever is the longer, make entry of the copyright in the registry book of the Stationers' Company in terms of The Copyright Act, 1842, and in the case of all musical works first published in the United Kingdom after the commencement of this Act the entry shall, in addition to the other requirements of the said Act, set forth the true name and place of abode of the author and composer and the true name and place of abode of the owner of the copyright, and otherwise the provisions of this Act shall not apply to such copyright."—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause be now read a second time."

The Solicitor-General (*Sir Edward Carson, Dublin University*) 1379
Mr. Atherley-Jones (*Durham, N. W.*) 1380
Mr. Malcolm (*Suffolk, Stowmarket*) 1381
Mr. Dalziel (*Kirkcaldy Burghs*) 1382
Mr. Lloyd Morgan (*Carmarthenshire, W.*) 1383
Mr. Harwood (*Bolton*) 1384
Mr. Weir (*Ross and Cromarty*) 1385

Question put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed to the Clause—

"In line 3, to leave out the words 'one month' and insert the words 'twelve months.'"—(*Mr. Galloway*).

Mr. Weir 1385
Lord Edmund Fitzmaurice (*Wiltshire, Cricklade*) 1386

Question put, and negatived.

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and agreed to.

Clause, as amended, added.

Mr. Caldwell 1386

Another clause (Registration of assignments of copyright).

"The assignee of the copyright of any musical work first published in the United Kingdom after the commencement of this Act shall, within one month of his becoming assignee of such musical copyright, cause an entry to be made in the registry book of the Stationers' Company kept in terms of The Copyright Act, 1842, setting forth his true name and address, and the deed of assignment or other deed or title under which he became and is assignee, and otherwise the provisions of this Act shall not apply to such copyright.'"—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Brought up, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause be now read a second time."

Mr. Galloway 1387
Mr. Hemphill (*Tyrone, N.*) 1387
Sir Edward Carson 1387
Mr. H. D. Greene (*Shrewsbury*) 1388
Sir Francis Powell (*Wigan*) 1388

Question put and agreed to.

June 10.] *Page*

Amendment proposed to the clause—

> "In line 3, to leave out the words 'one month' and insert the words 'twelve months.'"—(*Mr. Galloway.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. Galloway 1388

Amendment proposed to the clause—

> "In line 6, to leave out the words 'and the deed of assignment or other deed or title under which he became and is assignee.'"—(*Mr. Galloway.*

Mr. Caldwell 1388

Amendment agree to.

Mr. Hemphill 1389
Mr. Galloway 1389

Amendment proposed to the clause—

> "At the end to add the words 'until it has been so registered.'"—(*Mr. H. D. Greene.*)

Question proposed, "That these words be there added."

Amendment by leave, withdrawn.

Clause, as amended, added.

Mr. Atherley-Jones 1389

Another clause (Discretion of Court as regards fine and costs).

> "Where in any proceedings before a Court of summary jurisdiction under this Act, the Court is satisfied with regard to any musical work that the reasonable requirements of the public with reference to such musical work have not been satisfied, the Court in its discretion may refuse to grant a search warrant, and where an offence is proved may impose a nominal fine, and the cost in the action or proceedings shall be in the absolute discretion of the Court."—(*Mr. Atherley-Jones.*)

Bought up, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

The Under Secretary of State for the Home Department (*Mr. Cochrane, Ayrshire, N.*) 1391
Mr. Harwood 1392
Mr. Weir 1392
Mr. H. D. Greene 1394
Mr. Soares (*Devonshire, Barnstaple*) 1396
Mr. Bousfield (*Hackney, N.*) 1396
Mr. Brigg (*Yorkshire, W.R., Keighley*) 1397
Mr. Alexander Cross (*Glasgow, Camlachie*) 1397
Mr. Caldwell 1398

June 10.] *Page*

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 74 ; Noes, 161. (Division List No. 144)

Mr. Harwood 1403

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

" In page 1, line 5, to leave out Clause 1."—(*Mr. Harwood.*)

Question proposed, " That the words of the clause to the word ' or,' in page 1, line 6, stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Galloway 1405
Mr. Caldwell 1405
Major Seely (*Isle of Wight*) 1407
Mr. Weir 1408

Question put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In Clause 1, page 1 line 6, after the word ' Prints,' to insert the words ' for sale. ' "—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed to the Bill.

" In Clause 1, page 1, line 6, to leave out the words ' or procures.' " —(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Mr. Caldwell 1410

Amendment negatived.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

" In Clause 1, page 1, line 6, after the word ' printed,' to insert the words ' for sale.' "—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. Caldwell 1410

Amendment proposed—

" In Clause 1, page 1, line 8, to leave out Sub-section (2) of Clause 1."—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Question proposed, " That the words of the sub-section to the word ' or,' in page 1, line 9, stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Courtenay Warner (*Staffordshire, Lichfield*) 1411
Mr. Dalziel 1411
Mr. Weir 1412
Captain Ellice (*St. Andrew's Burghs*) 1412

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 183 ; Noes, 66. (Division List No. 145.)

Mr. Caldwell 1415

And it being half-past Five of the clock further consideration of the Bill, as amended, stood adjourned.

Bill as amended (by the Standing Committee), to be further considered upon Friday next.

Weights and Measures Bill.—As amended (by the Standing Committee) considered.

Mr. Bousfield (*Hackney, N.*) 1416
Mr. Caldwell (*Lanarkshire, Mid*) 1416

Consideration, as amended (by the Standing Committee), deferred till Friday next.

Adjourned at twenty-six minutes before Six o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS: MONDAY, 13TH JUNE, 1904.

MILITARY MANŒUVRES ACT, 1897.—The King's Answer to the Address of Thursday last, reported by the Lord Steward (*E. Pembroke and Montgomery*) .. 1417

VISCOUNT DE VESCI.—Ordered, That the Report of the Lord Chancellor of the United Kingdom, made to the House of Lords on Friday last, that the right of the Viscount de Vesci to vote at the elections of representative Peers for Ireland has been established to his satisfaction, be sent to the Clerk of the Crown in Ireland, together with a certificate stating that such Report has been made, and that the House has ordered it to be sent to the said Clerk of the Crown in Ireland 1417

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with :—

Local Government Provisional Orders (Gas) ; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 6) ; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8).

Also the Certificates that no Standing Orders are applicable to the following Bills :—

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 7) ; Commons Regulation (Merrow) Provisional Order ; Commons Regulation (Oxshott) Provisional Order ; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 12).

June 13.] *Page*

And also the Certificates that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with :—

Carlisle Corporation ; Lytham Improvement ; Radcliffe Tramways and Improvement ; London United Tramways ; Middlesbrough, Stockton-on-Tees, and Thornaby Tramways ; Thames Steamboat Service ; Skipton Water River Improvement.

The same were ordered to lie on the Table 1417

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE.—Report from, That the Standing Orders not complied with in respect of the Tottenham Improvement ; Strabane, Raphoe, and Convoy Railway, ought to be dispensed with and Bills allowed to proceed. Read and agreed to 1418

ELYSÉE PALACE HOTEL COMPANY, LIMITED, BILL [H.L.].—Commons Amendments considered and agreed to 1418

LANCASHIRE AND YORKSHIRE RAILWAY (VARIOUS POWERS) BILL.—Read 2^a and committed. The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection 1418

TRAFFORD PARK BILL [H.L.].—Read 3^a, and passed, and sent to the Commons .. 1418

LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL (MONEY) BILL.—London County Council (Tramways and Improvements Bill). Brought from the Commons ; read 1^a and referred to the Examiners 1418

ST. MARYLEBONE ELECTRIC LIGHTING BILL.—Returned from the Commons with the Amendements agreed to 1418

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (NO. 1) BILL.—Read 3^a (according to order) with the Amendment, and passed, and returned to the Commons .. 1418

RETURNS, REPORTS ETC.

TRADE REPORTS—ANNUAL SERIES.

No. 3183. Portugal (North Portugal). No. 3184. France (Bordeaux) .. 1418

SAVINGS BANKS AND FRIENDLY SOCIETIES.—(Post Office Savings Bank Fund)—Account for the year ended 31st December, 1903 ; (Savings Bank Fund) ; (Friendly Societies Fund)—Accounts for the year ended 20th November, 1903.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table .. 1418

PRIVATE AND PROVISIONAL ORDERS CONFIRMATION BILLS.—Ordered, That Standing Orders Nos. 72 and 82 be suspended for the remainder of the session .. 1418

THE IRISH LAND PURCHASE ACT.

Lord Clonbrock 1419
Lord Barrymore 1425
The Lord Chancellor of Ireland (*Lord Ashbourne*) 1426
The Earl of Westmeath 1429
Lord Oranmore and Brown 1431
The Earl of Arran 1432
The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (*The Marquess of Lansdowne*) 1433

THE IMPERIAL YEOMANRY.

Lord Lovat 1435
Earl Roberts 1449
The Marquess of Winchester 1441
Lord Harris 1443
The Earl of Erroll 1445
The Marquess of Waterford 1448
Viscount Galway 1449
The Under Secretary of State for War (*The Earl of Donoughmore*) .. 1449

THE RESERVATION OF THE COASTING TRADE.

Lord Muskerry 1454
The Marquess of Lansdowne 1456
Earl Spencer 1459

House adjourned at five minutes past Seven o'clock till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock,

---

HOUSE OF COMMONS: MONDAY, 13TH JUNE, 1904

The House met at Two of the Clock

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

SUBSTITUTED BILLS (STANDING ORDER 62 COMPLIED WITH).—MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, referred on the First Reading thereof, Standing Order 62 has been complied with viz. :—Loch Leven Water Power Bill. Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time 1460

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH).—MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That in the case of the following Bill originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz. :—Richard Jaeger's Patent Bill [Lords]. Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time 1460

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS [LORDS] (NO STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE).—MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords and referred on the First Reading thereof, no Standing Orders are applicable, viz. :—Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 1) Bill [Lords]. Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time To-morrow 1460

POST OFFICE SITES BILL (STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE THERETO COMPLIED WITH).—MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That in the case of the following Bill, referred pursuant to the Order of the House of the 3rd day of June, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz. :—Post Office Sites Bill 1461

June 13.] Page

Colney Hatch Gas Bill; Gomersal Gas Bill; North Staffordshire Railway Bill; Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to 1461

Chesterfield Gas and Water Board Bill [LORDS].—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 1461

London County Council (Money) Bill.—Read the third time and passed .. 1461

London County Council (Tramways and Improvements) Bill.—Read the third time, and passed. [New Title.] 1461

New River Company Bill [LORDS].—As amended, considered; an Amendment made; Bill to be read the third time 1461

Tynemouth Gas Bill [LORDS].—As amended, considered; to be read the third time 1461

Education Board Provisional Order Bill (Swansea).—Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 14) Bill; Local Government Provisional Order (No. 15) Bill. Read the third time, and passed 1461

Dundee, Broughty Ferry and District Tramways Order Confirmation Bill; Leith Burgh Order Confirmation Bill; Motherwell and Bellshill Railway (Abandonment) Order Confirmation Bill. Considered; to be read the third time upon Wednesday 1461

Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Provisional Order Bill.—Read a second time and committed 1461

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP H).—Ordered, That John Thomas Coates do attend the Committee on Group H of Private Bills this day, at Three of the clock .. 1461

Clyde Navigation (Works) Bill.—Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table 1462

Street Betting Bill [LORDS].—Read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 230.] 1462

Local Government Provisional Order (No. 4) Bill.—Reported with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table. Bill, as amended, to be considered To-morrow 1462

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP I).—Sir JOHN BRUNNER reported from the Committee on Group I. of Private Bills; That, for the convenience of parties, they had adjourned till Tuesday, 21st June, at Twelve o'clock.

Report to lie upon the Table 1462

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to—Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill; Local Government Provisional Order (Poor Law) Bill, without Amendment.

June 13.] *Page*

Kirkby-in-Ashfield Urban District Gas Bill; Littlestone-on-Sea and District Water Bill; Brixham Gas Bill; Acton Improvement Bill, with Amendments.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to extend the limits of supply of the Newcastle and Gateshead Water Company and to enable local authorities within the additional limits to require the Company to supply them with water in bulk; and to empower the Company to raise further capital; and for other purposes." [Newcastle and Gateshead Water Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill intituled, "An Act to authorise the closing and sale of certain churches in the city of Liverpool and the borough of Wigan and the sale of certain vicarages or houses of residence, the extinction of certain ecclesiastical districts and parishes, the merger thereof in other districts and parishes, and the conversion of certain ecclesiastical districts into separate ecclesiastical parishes in the said city; and for other purposes." Liverpool and Wigan Churches Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confer further powers on the Derwent Valley Water Board; to confer powers upon the Corporation of Leicester with respect to the works authorised to be constructed by that Corporation under the powers of the Derwent Valley Water Act, 1899; to confer borrowing powers upon the Corporations of Derby, Leicester, Sheffield, and Nottingham; and for other purposes." [Derwent Valley Water Board Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to empower the Lord Mayor, Aldermen, and Citizens of the city of Belfast to construct and work Tramways, and to purchase by agreement the undertaking of the Belfast Street Tramways Company, including the Tramways constructed by the Sydenham District Belfast Tramways Company, and the Belfast and Ligoniel Tramways Company, and the Tramways of the Belfast and County Down Railway Company; and for other purposes." [Belfast Corporation (Tramways) Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act for incorporating and conferring powers on The Lothians Electric Power Company." [The Lothians Electric Power Bill [Lords] 1462

Newcastle and Gateshead Water Bill [Lords]; Liverpool and Wigan Churches Bill [Lords]; Derwent Valley Water Board Bill [Lords]; Belfast Corporation (Tramways) Bill [Lords]; The Lothians Electric Power Bill [Lords]. Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills 1463

Preston, Chorley, and Horwich Tramways Bill [Lords]; Tyneside Tramways and Tramroads Bill [Lords]. Reported, with Amendments; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 1463

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Two Petitions from Aberdeen, for alteration; to lie upon the Table 1463

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition from Edinburgh, in favour; to lie upon the Table 1464

Factory and Workshop Act (1901) Amendment Bill.—Petition from Sanitary Institute, in favour; to lie upon the Table 1464

Licensing Bill.—Petitions against; from London; Stourbridge (four); Wollaston; Leicester; Glasgow; Bournemouth; Brighton; Lee; Darlaston (two); Chester (four); Bransgore; Inverurie; Portsmouth; Saltney; King's Hill; Richmond; Blackburn; Darlaston Green; Halton; Runcorn (two); Wellington; Wood Green; Worsley; Budleigh Salterton; Harrow Road; Moxley; Worksop; Hulland; Aston; Corbridge; Wall; Hexhamshire; Mickley; Harlow Hill; Ovington; Hexham (two); Hedley; Huncote; Walkden; Gunnerton; Barrasford; Wark; Stocksfield; Horsley; Rangeworthy; Bradley; Wednesbury; Oldbury; Humshaugh; Wylam; Newton; Hampstead; Jarrow; Adderbury; Lampeter; Greenock; Wolverhampton; Pen (two); Wigan; Cilgwyn; Wye Valley; Tregaron; Lavender Hill; Horsley Fields; Somerleyton; Wandsworth; Blyth; Boldon Colliery; Selby; Jarrow; Llanarmon; Tregeiriog; Flushing; Huntley; Stepney; Cwmbran; Kirkwall; Rochdale (two); Brecon; Llanfaes; Durham; Kiveton Park; Rotherham; Women's National Liberal Association; Doncaster; Balby; Sheffield; Leamington; Hastings; Hendon; Denaby Main; Blairgowrie; Choppington Colliery; Market Drayton (two); West Cornwall; Whitchurch; Heywood; Gloucester; Hollinwood; Gospel Ash; Whixall; Crimsworth; Boosbeck; Bill Quay; Paisley; Banbury; Ebbw Vale; Penrith; Lochans; Sowerby Bridge; Montrose; Daventry and Long Buckby; Daventry; Newburn-on-Tyne. Bridgend District; Dunston; Wolverhampton; Doncaster; Guisborough and Redcar; and Hendon; to lie upon the Table 1464

Prevention of Pollution of Rivers and Streams Bill.—Petition from Sanitary Institute, in favour; to lie upon the Table 1465

Sale of Butter Bill.—Petition from Sanitary Institute, in favour; to lie upon the Table 1465

Valuation Bill.—Petition from Liverpool, against; to lie upon the Table .. 1465

Valuation Bill.—Petition from Stourbridge, for alteration; to lie upon the Table 1465

Valuation Bill.—Petitions in favour; from Sheffield; and Sunderland; to lie upon the Table 1465

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Merchant Seamen's Fund.—Paper [presented 10th June] to be printed. [No. 208] 1465

Arrests for Drunkenness (Ireland).—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 19th May; *Mr. Sloan*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. No. 209.] 1465

Savings Banks and Friendly Societies.—Accounts presented, showing the Interest accrued in respect of the Securities standing in the names of the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt to the credit of the Post Office Savings Banks Fund for the year ended 31st December, 1903, and of the Fund for the Banks for Savings and the Fund for Friendly Societies for the year ended 20th November, 1903 [by Act]. to lie upon the Table and to be printed. [No. 210.] 1466

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).—Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3182 to 3184 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1466

COUNTY AND BOROUGH LUNATIC ASYLUMS.—Address for "Return of Expenditure on Lunatic Asylums up to the 1st day of January, 1904, and of the average Cost per head of Lunatics during the year ended the 31st day of March, 1903:—

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.		
Asylum.	Number of Patients provided for on the 1st day of January, 1904.	Total cost of buildings and land up to the 1st day of January, 1904.	Cost per bed of buildings and land.	Average weekly cost per head in respect of interest and repayment of loans for land and buildings, rental of land and buildings, and repairs, for year ended the 31st day of March, 1903.	Average weekly cost per head for maintenance and other charges not included in Column 5, for year ended the 31st day of March, 1903.	Total average weekly cost per head for year ended 31st day of March, 1903.	Receipts from—		
							(a) Parliamentary grants, and payments by County and County Borough Councils from Exchequer Contribution Account.	(b) Payment for Patients.	(c) Rates.
Totals:									
England and Wales -									
Scotland - - -									
Ireland - - -									
Grand Totals - - -									

—(*Mr. Charles Hobhouse.*) 1466

SHOPS.—Address for "Return showing the counties and boroughs in which Inspectors have been appointed under The Shop Hours Acts, 1892 to 1895, and The Seats for Shop Assistants Act, 1899, and number of Inspectors appointed in the following form:—

1.	2.	3.	4.
Counties and boroughs in which Inspectors have been appointed.	Total number of Inspectors appointed.	Inspectors giving their whole time to duties under the Shop Hours and Seats for Shop Assistants Acts.	Inspectors performing duties under the Shop Hours and Seats for Shop Assistants Acts in conjunction with other public duties.

—(*Sir Charles Dilke.*) 1467

June 13.] *Page*

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

THE "ENCHANTRESS."—Question, Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis); Answer, Mr. Pretyman 1467

MARINE INSURANCE BILL.—Question, Sir Albert Rollit (Islington, S.); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1468

BRITISH SALVAGE COMPANIES AND NAVAL WORK.—Question, Sir John Leng (Dundee); Answer, Mr. Pretyman 1469

PIECEWORK IN DEVONPORT DOCKYARD.—Question, Mr. Bell (Derby); Answer, Mr. Pretyman 1469

OPPORTUNITIES FOR LEARNING TELEGRAPH WORK—CASE OF MR. CHANDLER.—Question, Mr. Henderson (Durham, Barnard Castle); Answer, Lord Stanley 1470

POST OFFICE EXAMINATION AT CORK—OUTSIDERS IN LIMITED COMPETITION.—Question, Mr. James O'Connor (Wicklow, W.); Answer, Lord Stanley .. 1470

EXTENSION OF TELEPHONE SERVICE TO NENAGH.—Question, Mr. P. J. O'Brien (Tipperary, N.); Answer, Lord Stanley 1471

POOR LAW CHILDREN SUFFERING FROM RINGWORM AND OPHTHALMIA.—Question, Sir Walter Foster (Derbyshire, Ilkeston); Answer, Mr. Walter Long .. 1471

NURSING OF SICK POOR IN WORKHOUSES—LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD ORDER.—Question, Sir Harry Samuel (Tower Hamlets, Limehouse); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 1472

POOR LAW CHILDREN EMIGRATED TO CANADA.—Question, Mr. Herbert Samuel (Yorkshire, Cleveland); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 1473

ROYAL COMMISSION ON LOCAL TAXATION—REPRESENTATION OF BOARDS OF GUARDIANS.—Question, Mr. Osmond Williams (Merionethshire); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 1473

UNIFORMITY OF VALUATION.—Question, Mr. Osmond Williams; Answer, Mr. Walter Long 1473

PROMOTION OF INCOME TAX CLERKS IN IRELAND.—Question, Mr. Nannetti (Dublin, College Green); Answer, Mr. Victor Cavendish 1474

TEA DUTY—BULKING OF PARCELS OF TEA IN BOND.—Question, Mr. Lough (Islington, W.); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 1474

CONDITION OF GOKTEIK RAILWAY BRIDGE, UPPER BURMA.—Question, Mr. W. F. D. Smith (Strand, Westminster); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 1475

RELATIONS BETWEEN INDIA AND AFGHANISTAN.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill (Donegal, S.); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 1476

LAW AS TO WIDTH OF TYRE OF LOADED WAGONS IN IRELAND.—Question, Mr. Ffrench (Wexford, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1476

Page

COMPULSORY DESTRUCTION OF BEES SUFFERING FROM FOUL BROOD.—Question, Mr. Ffrench; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1476

IMPURE IRISH WHISKY.—Question, Mr. Ffrench; Answer, Mr. Wyndham .. 1477

IRISH PETTY SESSIONS—RIGHT OF APPEAL FROM SENTENCES.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1477

RECOMMENDATIONS OF ROYAL COMMISSION ON MILITIA AND VOLUNTEERS.—Question, Sir Ernest Flower (Bradford, W.); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster .. 1478

COST OF JAPANESE ARMY.—Question, Mr. Trevelyan (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1478

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

SUBMARINE A1—COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY.—Questions, Mr. Edmund Robertson (Dundee) and Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis); Answers, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Pretyman, Suffolk, Woodbridge) 1479

ENFIELD SMALL ARMS FACTORY—PAYMENT OF GRATUITIES TO DISCHARGED WORKMEN.—Question, Captain Norton (Newington, W.); Answer, The Financial Secretary to the War Office (Mr. Bromley Davenport, Cheshire, Macclesfield) 1479

MANUFACTURE OF RIFLES—GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE ORDERS.—Question, Captain Norton; Answer, Mr. Bromley Davenport 1480

MILITARY DRAFTS FOR INDIA.—Question, Sir J. Dickson-Poynder (Wiltshire, Chippenham); Answer, Mr. Bromley Davenport 1481

IMPERIAL YEOMANRY—TERM OF RE-ENGAGEMENT.—Question, Sir J. Dickson Poynder; Answer, Mr. Bromley Davenport 1481

DUBLIN CORPORATION AND SOLDIERS IN THE STREETS.—Questions, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.), Mr. Joseph Devlin (Kilkenny, N.) and Mr. Nannetti (Dublin, College Green); Answers, Mr. Bromley Davenport 1482

CHINESE LABOUR LIMITATIONS IN THE TRANSVAAL.—Question, Mr. Hunt (Shropshire, Ludlow); Answer, The Secretary for State for the Colonies (Mr. Lyttelton, Warwick and Leamington) 1483

PAY OF CHINESE LABOURERS IN THE TRANSVAAL.—Questions, Dr. Macnamara (Camberwell, N.), Sir John Gorst (Cambridge University), Mr. Bryce (Aberdeen, S.) and Sir Henry Fowler (Wolverhampton, E.); Answers, Mr. Lyttelton 1483

GANGERS AND OVERSEERS IN THE TRANSVAAL MINES.—Question, Dr. Macnamara; Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 1485

ARRIVAL OF CHINESE IMMIGRANTS AT DURBAN.—Question, Mr. Whitley (Halifax); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 1486

ALLEGED UNREST AMONGST THE ZOUTPANSBERG NATIVES.—Question, The Master of Elibank; Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 1486

June 13.] *Page*

Chinese Labour in the Straits Settlement.—Question, Mr. Trevelyan (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1487

British Indian Subjects in the Transvaal.—Question, Mr. Herbert Roberts Denbighshire, W.); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 1487

Indian Tea Trade with Persia.—Question, Mr. Gibson Bowles; Answer, The Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Earl Percy, Kensington, S.) 1478

Brussels Sugar Convention—Colonial Bounty Fed Sugars.—Question, Mr. Gibson Bowles; Answer, Earl Percy 1488

Glasgow Milk Supply—Sore Throat Epidemic.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, The Secretary to the Local Government Board (Mr. Grant Lawson, Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk) 1489

Poor Law Inspectors' Returns of Expenditure.—Question, Mr. Atherley-Jones (Durham, N.W.); Answer, Mr. Grant Lawson 1490

Motor Traffic Regulations.—Question, Mr. Gardner (Berkshire, Wokingham); Answer, Mr. Grant Lawson 1490

Transvaal War Contribution.—Question, Mr. Whitley; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.) 1491

General Blake's Widow's Documents.—Question, Mr. P. J. O'Brien (Tipperary, N.); Answer, The Financial Secretary of the Treasury (Mr. Victor Cavendish, Derbyshire, W.) 1491

Geological Survey of Devonshire.—Question, Mr. Soares (Devonshire, Barnstaple); Answer, The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education (Sir William Anson, Oxford University) 1491

Cornahilta School Teacher.—Question, Mr. Jordan (Fermanagh, S.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 1492

Lough Erne Drainage Charges.—Question, Mr. T. W. Russell (Tyrone, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1492

Mr. Hurley's Killarney Estate.—Question, Mr. Murphy (Kerry, E.) Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1493

Warden Estate, Reinstatement of Evicted Tenants.—Questions, Mr. Boland (Kerry, S.); Answers, Mr. Wyndham 1494

Improvement of Roscommon County Councillor.—Question, Mr. Hayden (Roscommon, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1495

Dublin Cycle Stealing Case.—Question, Mr. Mooney (Dublin County S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1495

Irish Board of Education—Attendance Rule.—Question, Mr. Sheehy (Meath, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1496

Belfast Valuation Appeals.—Question, Mr. Joseph Devlin; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1496

June 13.]

Page

CASE OF CONSTABLE ANDERSON.—Questions, Mr. Dillon (Mayo, E.); Answers, Mr. Wyndham 1497

INSURANCE OF IRISH PUBLIC BUILDINGS.—Questions, Mr. Murnaghan (Tyrone, Mid), and Mr. James O'Connor (Wicklow, W.); Answers, Mr. Victor Cavendish 1501

FOOD SUPPLY COMMISSION.—Question, Mr. Runciman (Dewsbury); Answer, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 1501

GREAT BRITAIN, RUSSIA, AND PERSIA.—Question, Mr. Gibson Bowles; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1502

COMMITTEE OF PRIVILEGES.—Question, Mr. Gibson Bowles; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1502

MONEY RESOLUTIONS.—Question, Mr. Edmund Robertson; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1503

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.—Questions, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs); Mr. Gibson Bowles, Mr. John Redmond (Waterford), and Mr. Whitley; Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1505

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[MR. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 3:—

Mr. Thomas Shaw (Hawick Burghs) 1505

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the consideration of Clause 3 be postponed."—(*Mr. Thomas Shaw.*)

The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. Graham Murray, Buteshire) 1507
Mr. Buchanan (Perthshire, E.) 1508
Mr. Edmund Robertson (Dundee) 1509

Question put, and negatived.

Mr. Caldwell (Lanarkshire, Mid) 1511

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 16, to leave out all words from the word 'for' down to the word 'Aberdeen' in page 2, line 3, in order to insert the words 'every parish in Scotland' instead thereof."—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

June 13.] *Page*

Mr. A. Graham Murray 1518
Mr. Ainsworth (Argyllshire) 1519
Mr. Buchanan 1519
Dr. Macnamara (Camberwell, N.) 1520
Mr. Caldwell 1521
Sir J. Fergusson (Manchester, N.E.) 1521
Mr. Thomas Shaw 1521
Mr. H. C. Richards (Finsbury, E.) 1522

Question put and agreed to.

Mr. Crombie (Kincardineshire) 1522
Mr. Maconochie (Aberdeenshire, E.) 1523

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 17, to leave out the words 'districts of.'"—(*Mr. Maconochie.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

Mr. Charles Renshaw (Renfrewshire, W.) 1524
Mr. Bignold (Wick Burghs) 1527
Mr. Haldane (Haddingtonshire) 1527
Colonel Denny (Kilmarnock Burghs) 1528
Dr. Macnamara 1529
Mr. A. Graham Murray 1529
Mr. Weir 1530
Mr. Bryce (Aberdeen, S.) 1530
Mr. Maxwell (Dumfries-shire) 1532
Mr. Wallace (Perth) 1532
Mr. Maconochie 1533
Mr. Parker Smith (Lanarkshire, Partick) 1533
Mr. Ainsworth 1533
The Earl of Dalkeith (Roxburgh) 1533
Mr. Thomas Shaw 1534
Mr. Cathcart Wason (Orkney and Shetland) 1534
Mr. Caldwell 1535

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 23, at the end, to insert the words 'Provided that, before the commencement of this Act, on a representation received not later than the twenty-fifth day of October, one thousand nine hundred and four, from a county council or district committee of a county council, or from a town council, or from an existing school board, and from time to time after the commencement of this Act, on representation from a school board, the Secretary for Scotland may, by order or orders, which order or orders shall be laid as soon as may be upon the Table of both Houses of Parliament, determine that any two counties including as aforesaid, or that any two or more local government districts, including as aforesaid, in any county, shall, for the purposes of this Act, be combined into one district, or that any county not divided into local government districts, including as aforesaid, shall, for the purposes of

June 13.] *Page*

this Act, be divided into districts, and such districts shall be specified in the order; and the foregoing provisions of this section shall not apply to any county or local government district, including as aforesaid, so far as comprised within a district or districts specified in any such order, but a school board shall be established for each of the districts so specified. In making an order after the commencement of this Act under this section the Secretary for Scotland shall follow as nearly as may be the procedure prescribed by the forty-sixth section of the Local Government (Scotland) Act, 1894, with respect to the making of an order for altering the boundaries of parishes, and shall have the necessary powers in that behalf, including power to provide for all matters which appear to him necessary or proper for giving full effect to the order, and where necessary for the adjustment and distribution of the powers, property, liabilities, debts, officers, and servants of the school boards affected by the order, and for the settlement of differences arising out of the order.' "—(*Mr. A. Graham Murray*).

Question proposed, " That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Parker Smith 1536

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

" In line 8, after the word ' two ' to insert the words ' or more.' "—(*Mr. Parker Smith*).

Question proposed, " That those words be there inserted."

Mr. A. Graham Murray 1537
Mr. Thomas Shaw 1537
Mr. Bryce 1538

Amendment to the proposed Amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Caldwell 1539

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

" In line 8, after the word ' Parliament ' to insert the words ' but shall not come into force until after an Address in favour of the same shall have passed both Houses of Parliament.' "—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Question proposed, " That those words be there inserted."

Mr. A. Graham Murray 1540
Mr. Tennant (Berwickshire) 1540
Mr Cathcart Wason 1540
Mr. Dalziel (Kirkcaldy Burghs) 1541
Mr. Edmund Robertson 1542
Mr. Graham Murray 1543
Dr. Macnamara 1544
Mr. Crombie 1544
Mr. Caldwell 1544
Mr. A. Graham Murray 1545
Mr. Thomas Shaw 1546
Mr. A. Graham Murray 1546
Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs) 1548

June 13.] *Page*

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 82 ; Noes, 199 (Division List No. 146.)

Mr. George Brown (*Edinburgh, Central*) 1551

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

" In line 10, after the word ' county ' to insert the words ' or any local government district or any enumerated district.' "—(*Mr. George Brown.*)

Question proposed, " That those words be there inserted."

Mr. A. Graham Murray 1551

Question put, and negatived.

Mr. Ainsworth 1551

Proposed words inserted in the clause.

Mr. Parker Smith 1552

Amendment proposed—

" In page 2, line 3, after the word, ' Glasgow ' to insert the word ' Govan.' "—(*Mr. Parker Smith.*)

Question proposed, " That the word ' Govan ' be there inserted."

Mr. A. Graham Murray 1554
Mr. Caldwell 1556
Mr. Alexander Cross (*Glasgow, Camlachie*) 1557
Mr. Dalziel 1557

And, it being half past Seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress ; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

Education Board Provisional Orders (Cardiff and Newport (Monmouthshire) Bill (BY ORDER).—Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. Boland (*Kerry, S.*) 1558
Mr. Power (*Waterford, E.*) 1560

Amendment proposed—

" To leave out the word ' now ' and at the end of the Question to add the words ' upon this day six months.' "—(*Mr. Boland.*)

Question proposed, " That the word ' now ' stand part of the Question."

Sir Francis Powell (Wigan) 1560
Dr. Macnamara (Camberwell, N.) 1562
Colonel Nolan (Galway, N.) 1564
The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education (Sir William Anson, Oxford University) 1564
Mr. Lloyd George (Carnarvon Boroughs) 1566
Mr. Griffith Boscawen (Kent, Tunbridge) 1569
Lord Edmund Talbot (Sussex, Chichester) 1570
Sir Joseph Lawrence (Monmouth Boroughs) 1572

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed.

Education (Scotland) Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[MR. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 3.

Amendment proposed—

" In page 2, line 3, after the word ' Glasgow ' to insert the word ' Govan. ' "—(*Mr. Parker Smith.*)

Question again proposed, " That the word ' Govan ' be there inserted."

Mr. Dalziel 1573
Mr. Parker Smith 1573
Mr. Corbett (Glasgow, Tradeston) 1575

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 52 ; Noes, 189. (Division List No. 147.)

Colonel Denny 1577

Amendment proposed—

" In page 2, line 3, after the word ' Edinburgh ' to insert the word ' Leith.' "—(*Colonel Denny.*)

Question proposed, " That the word ' Leith ' be there inserted."

Mr. A. Graham Murray 1579
Mr. Thomas Shaw (Hawick Burghs) 1579
Mr. McCrae (Edinburgh, E.) 1580
Mr. Dobbie (Ayr Burghs) 1581
Mr. Munro Ferguson (Leith Burghs) 1582
Mr. Caldwell 1582

June 13.] Page

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 36 ; Noes, 171. (Division List No. 148.)

Amendment proposed,

In page 2, line 9, after the words 'Kinning Park,' to insert the word 'Rutherglen.' "—(*Colonel Denny.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'Rutherglen' be there inserted."

Mr. Caldwell 1585
Mr. A. Graham Murray 1586
Mr. Bryce 1587
Mr. Haldane (Haddingtonshire) 1587
Mr. Thomas Shaw 1587

Question put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed,

"In page 2, lines 9 and 10, to leave out the words 'and Pollokshaws.' "—(*Sir Charles Renshaw.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

Sir Charles Renshaw 1588

Question put and agreed to.

Mr. Charles Douglas (Lanarkshire, N.W.) 1588

Question proposed, "That Clause 3, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

Dr. Macnamara 1589
Mr. J. A. Pease (Essex, Saffron Walden) 1590
Mr. A. Graham Murray 1590

And it being Midnight, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress ; to sit again To-morrow.

SITE FOR DUKE OF YORK'S SCHOOL BILL [LORDS]—[SECOND READING].

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley) 1592
Mr. Whitley (Halifax) 1592

Second Reading deferred till To-morrow.

Adjourned at seven minutes after Twelve o'clock.

END OF TABLE OF CONTENTS TO VOL. CXXXV.

THE

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(*AUTHORISED EDITION*)

IN THE

FIFTH SESSION OF THE *TWENTY-SEVENTH PARLIAMENT* OF THE
UNITED KINGDOM OF *GREAT BRITAIN* AND *IRELAND*, IN THE
FOURTH YEAR OF THE REIGN OF

HIS MAJESTY KING EDWARD VII.

SEVENTH VOLUME OF SESSION.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Tuesday, 17*th May*, 1904.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with:—Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) [H.L.]; Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 1) [H.L.].

And also the Certificate that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with:—Plymouth Corporation.

The same were ordered to lie on the Table.

Gomersal Gas Bill; London, Tilbury, and Southend Railway Bill; Bexhill Water and Gas Bill; Littlestone-on-Sea and District Water Bill; Colney Hatch Gas Bill. Reported, with Amendments.

Sheppy Gas Bill; Richard Jaeger's Patent Bill [H.L.]. Reported, without Amendment.

Great Central Railway Bill; Doncaster Corporation Bill. Read 2^{a}, and committed. The Committees to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

Holywood Tramways Bill [H.L.]; North Wales Electric Power Bill [H.L.]; Bristol Corporation Bill [H.L.]. Read 3^{a}, and passed, and sent to the Commons.

Chippenham Gas Bill. Read 3^{a}, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway (Various Powers) Bill. Brought from the Commons; read 1^{a}; and referred to the Examiners.

Gosport Water Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments.

North Staffordshire Railway Bill. The King's consent signified; and Bill reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments.

Bristol Tramways (Extensions) Bill [H.L.]; Midland Railway Bill; Baker Street and Waterloo Railway Bill; Wolverhampton Corporation Bill; Harrow Road and Paddington Tramways Bill;

Oakengates, Dawley, and District Joint Water Board Bill [H.L.]; Humber Commercial Railway and Dock Bill. Report from the Committee of Selection, That the following Lords be proposed to the House to form the Select Committee for the consideration of the said Bills; viz., M. Winchester, M. Exeter, E. Dartmouth, E. Belmore (chairman), L. Digby; agreed to, and the said Lords appointed accordingly. The Committee to meet on Thursday the 9th of June next at Eleven o'clock; and all petitions referred to the Committee, with leave to the petitioners praying to be heard by counsel against the Bill to be heard as desired, as also counsel for the Bills.

Manchester Corporation (General Powers) Bill [H.L.]; Manchester Corporation Tramways Bill [H.L.]; Torquay Tramways Bill; Charing Cross, Euston, and Hampstead Railway Bill; Soothill Nether Urban District Tramways Bill; London and North Western Railway Bill. Report from the Committee of Selection, That the following Lords be proposed to the House to form the Select Committee for the consideration of the said Bills; viz., E. Strange (*D. Atholl*), E. Westmeath, L. Mendip (*V. Clifden*), L. Deramore, L. Hawkesbury (chairman); agreed to, and the said Lords appointed accordingly. The Committee to meet on Thursday the 9th of June next at Eleven o'clock; and all petitions referred to the Committee, with leave to the petitioners praying to be heard by counsel against the Bills to be heard as desired, as also counsel for the Bills.

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (Birmingham) Bill [H.L.]. Committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Thursday next.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 1) Bill [H.L.]. Amendment reported (according to order), and Bill to be read 3^a on Thursday next.

Canal Rates and Charges (Regents Canal) Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill [H.L.]. Read 2^a (according to order).

PETITIONS.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES (METRIC SYSTEM) BILL [H.L.].

Petitions in favour of; of town, city, and county councils of; Barrow in Furness; Canterbury; Chelmsford; Chester; Deptford; Huddersfield; Islington; Lewisham; Macclesfield; Radnorshire; Salford; Workington; Worthing; Wandsworth; Worcestershire Chamber of Agriculture; Institution of Engineers and Shipbuilders in Scotland; Liverpool and District Society of Incorporated Accountants. Read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TATIONERY OFFICE.

Fourth Report of the Controller of His Majesty's Stationery Office.

ACCIDENTS.

General Report to the Board of Trade upon the accidents that have occurred on the railways of the United Kingdom during the year 1903.

MINES AND QUARRIES (GENERAL REPORT AND STATISTICS FOR 1902: PART IV. COLONIAL AND FOREIGN STATISTICS).

Statistics relating to persons employed, out put, and accidents at mines and quarries in the British Colonies and in Foreign Countries, edited by Sir Clement le Neve Foster, D.Sc., F.R.S.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

UNION OF BENEFICES (METROPOLIS) ACT, 1860.

Scheme of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners for effecting the union of the benefice of St. John, Fitzroy Square, in the Metropolis, and the benefice of St. Saviour, Fitzroy Square, and for effecting certain other measures incidental to or arising out of such union. Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and to be printed. (No. 80.)

ARKLOW HARBOUR.

Report of the Arklow Harbour Commissioners, and Statement of Accounts for 1903. Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

Prevention of Corruption Bill [H.L.]; Bills of Exchange Act, 1882, Amendment Bill [H.L.]; Prize Courts Bills [H.L.]. Reported from the Standing Committee without Amendment, and to be read 3ª on Thursday next.

Street Betting Bill [H.L.]. Reported from the Standing Committee with a further Amendment. The Report of the Amendments made in Committee of the Whole House, and by the Standing Committee, to be received on Thursday next.

NEW BILLS.

MARRIED WOMEN'S PROPERTY ACT (1882) AMENDMENT BILL [H.L.].

A Bill to amend the Married Women's Property Act, 1882, was presented by the Lord Chancellor; read 1ª; and to be printed. (No. 82.)

SEAMEN'S AND SOLDIERS' FALSE CHARACTERS BILL [H.L.].

A Bill to amend the law relating to the falsification of seamen's and soldiers' certificates of service or discharge, and to false statements made, used, or given in connection with entry or enlistment into His Majesty's Naval, Military, or Marine Forces—Was presented by the Viscount Hutchinson (*E. Donoughmore*); read 1ª; to be printed; and to be read 2ª on Tuesday the 7th of June next. (No. 81.)

MONUMENT TO LORD SALISBURY.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (The Marquess of LANSDOWNE): My Lords, I do not think that the Motion which I have placed upon the Paper can come as a surprise to any of your Lordships. I think, indeed, your Lordships would have been astonished if His Majesty's Government had not taken some such step as that which we are taking this evening. Your Lordships will recollect when at the beginning of this session we met here for the transaction of business our first thoughts were of the great loss which this House and the country at large had sustained by the death of the late Lord Salisbury. On both sides of the House feelings of regret and respect for his memory were expressed; and upon this occasion I do not think I am wrong in anticipating that, without any reference to Party considerations, your Lordships' House will be unanimous in desiring that this mark of respect should be shown to Lord Salisbury's memory; for, although he was a great Party leader, we have a right to think of him, now that he is no longer here, not so much as a Party leader, but as a great servant of the State, a great public man who gave his unrivalled gifts and abilities ungrudgingly to the service of his country. It has always been the custom of Parliament upon occasions of this kind to look at the matter from this standpoint.

When Lord Salisbury's illustrious colleague, the late Lord Beaconsfield, was taken from us it was Mr. Gladstone who moved in the House of Commons a Resolution similar to that which I have to move this evening; and when in time Mr. Gladstone himself disappeared from the scene of which he had been so bright an ornament for so many years, it was Mr. Balfour, the present Conservative Prime Minister, who moved the Resolution in favour of the erection of a monument to his memory. Therefore, my Lords, in view of the unanimity which I believe prevails in your Lordships' House, I shall not attempt a lengthened panegyric of Lord Salisbury; for, indeed, it would be impossible within the compass of such a statement as I have a right to make this evening to deal adequately with a career so long and with services so splendid as those which he rendered. Lord Salisbury was no less than fifty years in Parliament. Of these fifty years twenty were spent as a Minister of the Crown. During thirteen of them he was Prime Minister and Leader of this House, and during eleven of those years he bore the double burden of the Premiership and the office of Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, a double burden which I venture to think no mortal shoulders could bear for long with impunity. It is no exaggeration to say that you will find that during the history of that long life there was no single chapter that was idle or unprofitable.

In public life Lord Salisbury was conspicuous and distinguished among his peers. He was a great debater, a great master of language, but he never condescended to the arts of the demagogue. He never was content with a mere forensic triumph, but he compelled the attention of those who listened to him, not by studied effects or by elaborate ornaments of style, but by the spontaneous expression of a powerful and original intellect. I am tempted to add that you will find that same style, with all its force and all its merits, in the despatches which he has left behind him, and even in those official minutes which, as his successor, it has often been my good fortune to read. He was a Leader of this House who commanded the universal respect of your Lordships. He had a keen appreciation of the constitutional position of the House of Lords, and a keen respect for its great traditions; and he never took part even in those of our debates which might have seemed the least interesting without adding to them something of his own which rendered his contributions to our discussions memorable and instructive. As a Minister I suppose Lord Salisbury will best be remembered owing to his successful conduct of our foreign affairs during a lengthened period. He was a wise and prescient director of our foreign policy, and if I had to single out any one particular quality by which he was distinguished I should say that that which most impressed those who were associated with him was his calmness and self-restraint even in circumstances of the greatest difficulty. We can all of us recollect occasions, some of them of comparatively recent occurrence, when peace and war trembled in the balance, when a single false step or a single careless word might have involved this country in a dangerous catastrophe, and when if that catastrophe was avoided it was certainly due to the prudence and wisdom with which Lord Salisbury discharged the duties which belonged to his high office. If at the present moment we stand high amongst the Powers, if our word is respected, if our goodwill is desired, it is surely because Lord Salisbury laid deep and strong the foundation of that international reputation of which he was a faithful and jealous guardian.

Of Lord Salisbury's wisdom in counsel only those who had the high honour of serving with and under him can speak with full authority. Those of us who had that high honour will not readily forget the privilege which we enjoyed of being his colleagues. Of Lord Salisbury's other attainments I will only say this, that if the world of politics had not claimed him, he would have been, beyond all question, a conspicuous figure in the world of literature or science. But, my Lords, beyond all things his life, public and private, was characterised by splendid qualities of devotion to duty, of independence of judgment, of absolute unselfishness, of incapability of any sordid aims or unworthy methods, and by the loftiest patriotism. The value of such a public man cannot be measured merely by his achievements either in diplomacy or in legislation. Such a man leaves his mark upon the public life of his country, by his example and by the manner in which his conduct serves to raise the standard of public life. Surely we may say of Lord Salisbury that his example and his manner of conducting the public affairs of this country have left their mark upon the nation. The nation, I believe, recognises Lord Salisbury as one worthy of the highest honour which it could pay him, it desires that his memory should be commemorated by the erection of a suitable monument to him; and it is, therefore, I believe, with the entire approval of our fellow-countrymen at large that I venture to move on behalf of His Majesty's Government the Resolution standing in my name.

Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty praying that His Majesty will give directions that a monument be erected in the Collegiate Church of St. Peter's, Westminster, to the memory of the late Right Hon. the Marquess of Salisbury, with an inscription expressive of the high sense entertained by the House of his rare and splendid gifts, and of his devoted labours in Parliament and in great offices of State."—(*The Marquess of Lansdowne.*)

*EARL SPENCER: My Lords, I rise to second the Resolution which has been submitted to your Lordships by the noble

Marquess the Leader of the House. Here, where the memory of the great statesman to whom the Resolution refers is so fresh, and where he had such a commanding influence for a long period of his life, very little need be said in favour of the Resolution. The noble Marquess has spoken in feeling, eloquent, and appropriate terms of the late Lord Salisbury. He stood in a very different position towards Lord Salisbury from that which I occupied. Lord Lansdowne was a colleague of Lord Salisbury in the Government and the Cabinet, and, therefore, he could speak with the greatest possible authority as to the influence, power, and skill with which Lord Salisbury fulfilled all of his many high duties. I never had that high privilege. I had only once for a short time an official connection with Lord Salisbury, and that was as a member of a Commission nearly forty years ago. But it is right that not only those who shared Lord Salisbury's views in politics but those who were opposed to him politically should speak on an occasion of this sort. In this country we do not raise monuments to statesmen as Party politicians. We believe the man to whom we propose to do this honour has done great services to his country and is honoured by the nation at large. It is, therefore, I think, appropriate that one of those who has been all his life in opposition to the noble Lord should rise and make a few observations as to this Resolution. It is not always that we give monuments at public expense to our Prime Ministers. During the last century, I think, we had as many as twenty Prime Ministers, and of these only six received public monuments at the public expense. Some of those were in office as Prime Minister a very long period. Mr. Pitt's tenure of office was the longest, though most of his career, of course, belongs to the eighteenth century. Then there was Lord Liverpool, and next to him in this respect comes Lord Salisbury, who ended his career in the twentieth century. Mr. Perceval lost his life while he was in office, and was only Prime Minister for a very short time.

As to the impression Lord Salisbury made on the people and on those who opposed him, I entirely endorse what the noble Marquess said. He had transcendent ability, an ability which, if he had not been born in the sphere of politics, would have given him preeminence in both science and literature. In his political career I have often noticed the charm and adornment which his literary pursuits gave to all his great orations. Besides that, Lord Salisbury was a man of great political courage; he had the courage to propose and to support measures which he thought ripe for the country, and he had another quality which was somewhat remarkable. Holding high and lofty ideals on many matters, he not infrequently showed almost a singular disregard of what I may call the commonplaces of life, which sometimes led him to say things which startled both friends and adversaries alike. There was one quality of his to which I will venture to refer which, I think, is of the utmost importance in a great statesman—he always observed a stern loyalty to what was done in Parliament. When he was certain that Parliament was carrying out the determined wishes of the people of this country, even if he had opposed them, and was still in opposition—if he felt that the country had resolutely settled on a particular policy, Lord Salisbury did not try to upset it, even when he had the greatest power with his numerous supporters in this House and the other. I have said that it is necessary that the support of this monument should be national. On three occasions when Leader of a great Party he obtained great majorities when appealing to the country and this goes far to establish his claim to a national memorial. I feel that we ought to render honour to a man who has added honour to the long roll of Prime Ministers whom we have known in this country. We are bound to give this public tribute to what he has done for the nation, and to the way in which he has served the nation with energy and devotion throughout his long and distinguished career. I beg to second the Resolution.

On Question, Motion agreed to.

Ordered that the said Address be presented to His Majesty by the Lords with White Staves.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES (METRIC SYSTEM) BILL. [H. L.]

[THIRD READING.]

Order of the day for the Third Reading read.

LORD BELHAVEN AND STENTON: My Lords, in moving the Third Reading of this Bill I wish to make an earnest appeal to His Majesty's Government to give every facility in their power for the further progress of this measure. I make this appeal on two grounds. In the first place, the Select Committee of your Lordships' house to which this Bill was referred, received many Amendments from the various Government Departments, and they have embodied in the Bill the whole of those Amendments. Then there is the great support the Bill has received throughout the country, which is shown by the enormous number of petitions in its favour which have been sent in. The town, city, and county councils which have presented petitions represent a population of over 8,000,000. Fifty chambers of commerce have petitioned, as well as forty-two trades unions, representing 300,000 members, sixty teachers' associations, the inspectors of weights and measures in eighty districts, and thirty retail trades associations. Several chambers of agriculture and farmers' associations have also petitioned, and I may add that the whole of Scotland, as represented by the Scottish Chamber of Agriculture and the Highland Society, is with us. The petitioners too, include a vast number of engineers and manufacturers of all sorts. I think these facts prove that there is a very strong feeling in the country in favour of the adoption of the metric system

Moved That the Bill be now read 3ª."—(*Lord Belhaven and Stenton*)

On Question, Bill read 3ª; an Amendment (Privilege) made; Bill passed, and sent to the Commons.

COTTON AS CONTRABAND OF WAR.

LORD AVEBURY: My Lords, I rise to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether it is the case that the Russian Government has declared cotton to be contraband of war; whether His Majesty's Government recognise their right to do so; and whether any, and, if so, what steps have been taken in the matter. This declaration is a new departure. It may be that it only applies to a certain description of cotton which is used for explosives, but, however that may be, the interests concerned are very important, and they are anxious for information.

THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: My Lords, we received a few days ago from our representative in St. Petersburg a telegram announcing that the Russian Government had given notice that cotton was to be added to the list of articles declared to be contraband of war. We were not given any particulars with regard to the categories of cotton covered by this notification, and we have, therefore, thought it desirable to make inquiries on this subject. Of course there would be all the difference in the world if the notice applied only to cotton in a form in which it might be converted easily into combustibles, and not to cotton generally. We have not yet received any answer to our inquiry, and I should prefer, for the present at anyrate, to avoid expressing any opinion with regard to the question of right. If I receive any information, I shall be glad to communicate with the noble Lord.

TIBET.

*EARL SPENCER: My Lords, I rise to call attention to recent events in Tibet, and to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he has any information to give to the House. It is not quite a month since we had a debate of some length on this important subject; but since then some grave, and, I might almost say, disastrous, events have taken place which impel me to ask for further information before the holidays. I am not going into the whole question of the policy which led the Indian troops and this Mission into Tibet. We have already had a long discussion upon that, and I stated on the last occasion that I addressed your Lordships upon it that we on this Bench endorsed the views which were put forward by my noble friends Lord Reay and the Marquess of Ripon as to the policy which led to this Mission. I venture to say that the events which have since happened strengthen the belief that we were right. I shall not, however, refer to the points then raised. In my opinion from the very first it was impossible to expect that this Mission would continue to be a peaceful one. I understand now that time after time there have been serious conflicts, in which happily we have not incurred any great loss, but in which the unfortunate Tibetans have suffered very seriously. There has been, I fear, renewed complication. The Mission has been again attacked, and our troops, the escort of this so-called peaceful Mission, have been obliged to clear the villages round in self-defence, and very serious fighting has taken place.

I would refer to the several stages of this subject. On 6th October there was a question of advancing to Gyangtse. At that time the Government informed the Viceroy that an advance to Gyangtse was authorised if a complete rupture of negotiations at Khambajong proved inevitable. That was followed by another stage which began on 6th November when the advance was sanctioned under very special conditions. Those conditions were contained in a telegram from the Secretary of State to the Viceroy; they were that the step should not be allowed to lead to permanent occupation of the country or to permanent intervention in Tibetan affairs in any form, that the advance should be made for the sole purpose of obtaining satisfaction, and that as soon as reparation was obtained a withdrawal should be effected. The next stage was on 13th April, when there was an important debate in another place, in the course of which the Prime Minister made a strong speech on the subject. He said—

> "The telegram of 6th November was most carefully considered by the Cabinet before it was sent. It represented a policy—not a departmental policy of the Secretary of State in Council—but the carefully thought out views of the Government. It represented their views on 6th November, 1903; it represents those views in April, 1904; no change whatever has occurred; and I do not think that any change is likely to occur."

He concluded with these remarkable words—

> "My hon. friend who spoke last but one seems to think that circumstances will be too strong for us, and that we shall be driven on from one stage to another, until nothing short of permanent annexation is reached. Well, I contemplate no such unhappy contingency, and were it to occur I should consider it one of the greatest misfortunes that could possibly happen to the Indian Government or to this country."

A few days later there was the debate in your Lordships' House, when the noble Marquess the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs made a similar declaration of policy. The noble Marquess concluded with some words of caution which, perhaps, it is only fair that I should read. He said—

> "I do not by that mean to say that whatever happens we are never to move an inch beyond the limits therein laid down, but the policy was adopted after the fullest consideration and by it we shall be guided in dealing with the future aspects of the question."

I should like to know whether the policy enunciated on those occasions is the Government policy of to-day. There was another discussion on this subject on the 12th of this month, when an important decision was announced by the Secretary of State for India. The right hon. Gentleman said that the Government had arrived at the conclusion that recent events in Tibet made it inevitable that unless the Tibetans consented to negotiate at Gyangtse the Mission must advance to Lhasa. This was qualified by the statement that the Government of India had been authorised to give the Chinese Amban notice that if no competent Tibetan negotiator appeared in conjunction with him at Gyangtse within a period to be fixed by the Government of India, steps would be taken to negotiate at Lhasa itself.

That is a very rapid change in the decision of His Majesty's Government. It is not for me to say what is necessary at the present moment. That is a matter entirely for His Majesty's Government who have full information on the subject which we in opposition do not have. I would like to hear what the noble Marquess has to say as to the policy which is hereafter to guide us in reference to this subject. This is a matter of the utmost importance in view of similar occurrences in India in years gone by which have led to serious disaster. I accept in full what the noble Marquess stated on a previous occasion with reference to Russia, and will not now further refer to that phase of the matter. But I should like to know what our relations are with China. We hear in other places statements with regard to the co-operation of China in order to bring about a complete settlement of this difficulty. What is the nature of this co-operation? We have heard rumours that the Chinese Amban has at last reached Lhasa, after, I might almost say, long months of wandering in the dismal districts between China and Lhasa, and we also learn that he is going to meet Colonel Younghusband. Then we hear rumours that he has done nothing to prevent the attacks on us by the Tibetans, and that four of his servants or those of Captain Parr have been murdered by Tibetans. I should like to know what our relations are with China; whether we are in close touch with the Chinese Government at Pekin; whether they are helping us to settle this difficulty, and whether any attempt has been made by the Amban to try and influence the Tibetans, and prevent these attacks upon us. I sincerely hope that the Government will be able to give the House information, both with regard to the position of the Mission at this moment and to the future policy they intend to carry out in Tibet.

*THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (The Earl of HARDWICKE): My Lords, the noble Earl prefaced his remarks by saying that he would not enter into the reasons for the despatch of the Mission into Tibet. He told the House that he adhered to the views expressed by his noble friends Lord Reay and Lord Ripon on the occasion of a recent debate on this question. I have a very clear recollection of that debate, and I do not think that the views expressed by Lord Reay were at all consistent with those expressed by the noble Marquess Lord Ripon. The noble Marquess objected to the Mission absolutely, and implored His Majesty's Government to withdraw it. Lord Reay did no such thing. He merely asked for information as to the object of the Mission, and we willingly promised him all such information as we could give, and Papers were laid on the Table. I have ventured to recall this small point because it is a little difficult to know what view noble Lords opposite take of our policy with regard to Tibet.

There was only one point which the Government of India and His Majesty's Government had to consider before deciding to send an expedition to Tibet, and that point was simply this. Were all attempts to get into communication with the authorities at Lhasa to be abandoned? Were we to have no redress, simply because we could not get into communication with the authorities, for offences committed against Indian subjects, for the pulling down of our posts on the frontier, and for the non-adherence to a convention agreed to between the two countries? His Majesty's Government decided that that position was intolerable, and that the only way to remedy that state of affairs was to end it. They, therefore, decided to send a Mission into Tibet. The House will recollect that in the first instance we sent Colonel Younghuband to Khambajong, just over the Tibetan frontier. The Mission was decided on in April, 1903. It remained at Khambajong for many weary months. There were certain Tibetan officials there, but they informed Colonel Younghusband that they could not converse with him, neither could they pass on any communication he might give them to the Dalai Lama. They said they were prevented by tradition and by their religion from having any communication with the Mission at all. His Majesty's Government then decided that the Mission should advance to Gyangtse, and that advance, as the noble Earl has pointed out, was sanctioned in the telegram of November 6. That telegram clearly laid down the policy of His Majesty's Government. The Mission arrived at Gyangtse on 12th April last. It has waited patiently for the Chinese Amban and for duly accredited Tibetan envoys, but they have not arrived. Colonel Younghusband's force has been attacked on various occasions, and, as the noble Earl has pointed out, it has been necessary to remove Tibetans from certain posts that they occupied to the danger of our position.

That brings us to the situation as it is at present, and I would like incidentally to remark that the difficulties that have recently arisen, and the hostility that has been shown towards this Mission by the authorities at Lhasa, do not prove that the policy of His Majesty's Government was wrong, but rather that they had a danger to face which events have made easier for the public to realise. The principal question which the noble Earl addressed to His Majesty's Government was, What is our present policy? He endeavoured to show that the Government's policy, as declared by the noble Marquess and by the Prime Minister in another place, had undergone a sudden change in the decision that has been come to, to allow the Mission to advance as far as Lhasa if within a reasonable time delegates do not come to Gyangtse. I do not know on what statement the noble Earl bases his contention. Nothing has ever been said, so far as I am aware, by any member of His Majesty's Government that debars us from going to Lhasa if all our attempts at negotiating at Gyangtse fail. The policy of the Government is contained in the telegram of 6th November, which I will read to the House—

> "In view of the recent conduct of the Tibetans, His Majesty's Government feel that it would be impossible not to take action, and they accordingly sanction the advance of the Mission to Gyangtse. They are, however, clearly of opinion that this step should not be allowed to lead to occupation or to permanent intervention in Tibetan affairs in any form. The advance should be made for the sole purpose of obtaining satisfaction, and as soon as reparation is obtained a withdrawal should be effected. While His Majesty's Government consider the proposed action to be necessary, they are not prepared to establish a permanent Mission in Tibet, and the question of enforcing trade facilities in that country must be considered in the light of the decision conveyed in this telegram."

So far as I am aware, no other policy has been enunciated and there is nothing to debar our going to Lhasa. The next declaration on the part of His Majesty's Government to which the noble Earl referred was the answer given by my right hon. friend the Secretary of State in the other House on the 12th instant. In that answer my right hon. friend said—

> "His Majesty's Government have arrived at the conclusion that recent events in Tibet make it inevitable that, unless the Tibetans consent to negotiate at Gyangtse, the Mission must advance to Lhasa. The Government of India have been authorised to give the Chinese Amban notice that, if no competent Tibetan negotiator appears in conjunction with him at Gyangtse within a period to be fixed by the Government of India, we shall take steps to negotiate at Lhasa itself. The Government of India have at the same time been informed that His Majesty's Government do not intend in any way to depart from the policy laid down in the telegram to the Viceroy of the 6th November last."

I do not think it is possible for me in more definite terms to state what the views of His Majesty's Government are. The Government have clearly declared their view that it is not desirable permanently to occupy Tibet or permanently to interfere in the internal affairs of that country. But it is necessary to point out that circumstances have changed during the last few days. We are no longer in Tibet on a peaceful Mission; we are at the present moment at war with Tibet; and until we have by force of arms vindicated our position, and shown the Tibetans that we are not to be trifled with, His Majesty's Government ought not to be called upon by noble Lords opposite to give any definite pledge as to the exact form the settlement will take when hostilities are concluded.

The noble Earl asked what was the exact position of the Chinese Amban. I do not think it would be possible for a more difficult question to be put to any member of the Government. The Chinese Amban is at the present moment at Lhasa. He has had correspondence with Colonel Younghusband, and has declared that he is doing his best to get transport, and that he will come to Gyangtse at the earliest possible moment. But we have to face the fact that he has never arrived. The noble Earl has asked for information about the Chinese official whose servants were brutally murdered. They were the servants of Captain Parr, who is in the employ of the Chinese as a Customs officer, and is, I believe, under the orders of the Chinese Amban. With regard to the question as to Chinese co-operation, which is also difficult to answer, I think I am correct in stating that the Chinese are very anxious that we should come to a settlement with the Tibetans. They recognise that the Tibetans have given us grave cause for dissatisfaction, and that unless we are able to persuade the Tibetans to allow the Chinese representative to come to Gyangtse to discuss matters with us we shall be justified in advancing to Lhasa to conduct the negotiations there.

Lord TWEEDMOUTH: My Lords, the noble Earl who has just sat down has endeavoured rather to turn the questions of my noble friend by starting fresh points. The noble Earl asked what was our view of the policy of the Government in respect to this expedition to Tibet, and he rested the greater part of his defence of the expedition on events which had happened to the Mission whilst it was still occupying a peaceful position. He talked about the length of time that the Mission was kept waiting and of the insults that it received from the Tibetan authorities. Our objection to the Government's policy starts from a much earlier period. What was the original cause of this peaceful Mission? There were, I think, three causes put forward—first, the unwillingness of the Lama at Lhasa to receive the letters of the Indian Government; secondly, the removal of certain pillar posts on the frontier; and, thirdly, disputes about the grazing rights on the two sides of the frontier. I admit that these are subjects which would naturally give rise to feelings of annoyance on both sides. What we find fault with is that the Government settled on this Mission without fully realising what it was certain to lead to. The question really was, was it worth while, for the sake of the advantages that might be gained, to run the grave risks which such a Mission involved? The chances of difficulty and danger were far greater than any possible benefit that could be gained by India or by Great Britain from the efforts of the Mission. It seems to me that on this occasion, as on many others, the Government have proved themselves confirmed optimists. They always look for that to happen which could only happen under the most favourable circumstances. They never seem to regard the possibility of any operation in which they are engaged going wrong. Just as they thought, in the case of the South African war, that the Boers would not fight, so, apparently, they thought in the case of Tibet, that the Tibetans would also be found unwilling to fight, and that it was only necessary to make a sufficiently big demonstration on the Tibetan frontier to bring the Tibetan authorities to their bearings. By this Mission to Tibet the Government of India seem to me to have brought us almost to an *impasse*. Whichever way we turn difficulties of the gravest character are to be found. If we retire the dangers as well as the difficulties are patent to the most casual observer; but if we advance to Lhasa and find the Lama is not there, is it proposed to follow him into the misty regions beyond? And, having got to Lhasa, will the process of retirement to which you are pledged be found easy? I feel that a great deal more explanation is required than the Under-Secretary has given.

The noble Earl said that my noble friend the Leader of the Opposition had questioned him as to the position of the Chinese Amban. I think my noble friend's question went a great deal further. It had reference to the relations of His Majesty's Government with China at this moment. How far, he asked, have His Majesty's Government received the support of the Chinese Government from Pekin or elsewhere? The position of the Chinese Amban is of small importance. The real question is, how does China look upon these warlike operations within the territory of its vassal? Does it approve of them? Is it going to support you in bringing force to bear on the Lama at Lhasa, and in requiring concessions from the Lama? And will China be willing to see a Resident placed in parts of Tibet, which is only too likely to be involved by the course you are taking? I know the delicacy of speaking on this subject at this moment, and I can assure the House that I would not say a word to increase the present difficulty, but if the Government call for the support of men of all Parties to get them out of this trouble the least they can do is to take the country into their confidence and tell us exactly the position and the policy they mean to pursue

THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: My Lords, the noble Lord who has just sat down has attacked Colonel Younghusband's Mission from its first inception, and, not for the first time, we have had it suggested that the causes which led to the despatch of that Mission were causes so trivial and insignificant that we might well have declined to take notice of them. Well, no doubt, if you take them one by one they are small matters; but it is the cumulative effect of these acts of insolent aggression that the Government of India has had to take into consideration. I do not think it is just to the Government of India to suggest that they dealt in a precipitate or vindictive manner with the aggressive conduct of the Tibetans. On the contrary, the Government of India showed itself extremely long-suffering, and it was not until its patience had been tried to breaking-point that it was determined to take some measures to vindicate our authority on the Tibetan frontier. So far from failing to realise the seriousness of the task which lay before us, it was because we realised that Colonel Younghusband's Mission was a service of danger and might involve us in collision with Tibet that we sent with Colonel Younghusband that considerable escort, the presence of which was so much criticised by noble Lords opposite as inconsistent with the peaceful character of the Mission. But for the presence of that considerable escort the Mission would undoubtedly be at this moment in a position of danger which I hope I may say it actually is not.

*EARL SPENCER; It could not have gone.

THE MARQUESS OF LANDSDOWNE: Then the noble Earl throws us back on the alternative of again turning our face to the smiter and allowing the Government of India to be absolutely contemned. In regard to our relations with China in connection with Tibet, let me repeat again that from the first we have done our utmost to secure the co-operation and concurrence of China; and we certainly did secure the concurrence of China before the earliest steps were taken. And at this moment, so far as professions go, China is doing what she can to bring the Tibetans to reason. It is with that object the Amban has been sent to Lhasa. It is the presence of the Amban which is the outward and visible sign of such power as China has. If the Amban has not arrived at Lhasa until after interminable delays and wanderings in remote regions, if at this moment he is at Lhasa desiring to come down and negotiate with Colonel Younghusband and unable to do so because the Tibetans steal his transport from him—all that is evidence which proves conclusively how impotent the Chinese Government is to control the action of the Tibetans, and how little we can rely upon their aid in extricating us from the position in which we now find ourselves. We are in constant communication with the Chinese Government. We have given them every opportunity of assisting us through diplomatic channels; but I am afraid that the measure of their ability to assist us is the power of the Amban, who, as we all know, is more or less a prisoner at Lhasa.

I take it the Leader of the Opposition has brought this subject on because he desires to elicit once more from us a declaration of our Tibetan policy, not in setting up the Mission, but so far as the future is concerned. As the representative of the India Office has said, our policy remains the same. I venture to suggest it is not likely that when His Majesty's Government have deliberately adopted and announced a policy they should be driven from it merely because their Mission has been attacked by a lot of ragged barbarians in a remote region adjoining the Indian frontier. We do not so lightly as that abandon the policy we have arrived at. With regard to the advance to Lhasa, the noble Earl suggested that in itself denoted a change in policy. I express the contrary opinion. It seems to me that, whether at Gyangtse or at Lhasa, the policy remains the same policy — the policy of obtaining a satisfactory settlement from the Tibetans and reparation for the injuries they have done to us. So far as we are able to reassure the noble Earl by telling him that our policy remains what it was, I am very glad to give him that re-assurance; but, of course, so far as the operations now in progress are concerned, we must reserve to ourselves a certain amount of discretion in carrying them to a conclusion which will be honourable and satisfactory to ourselves.

House adjourned at a quarter before Six o'clock, to Thursday next, half-past Ten o'clock-

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 17th May, 1904.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz.:—Cardiff Railway Bill [Lords]; Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire Electric Power Bill [Lords]; Great Yarmouth Corporation Bill [Lords]; Leicestershire and Warwickshire Electric Power Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time.

Ryde Gas Bill. Lords Amendment considered, and agreed to.

Brymbo Water Bill. Read the third time, and passed.

Cambrian Railways Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

London and India Docks Company Bill. Read the third time, and passed.

Elysée Palace Hotel Company Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

Clyde Valley Electrical Power Bill [Lords]; St. Bartholomew's Hospital Bill [Lords]. Read a second time, and committed.

Land Drainage Provisional Order (Owston and West Butterwick, in County of Lincoln (Parts of Lindsey) Bill; Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill. Read a second time, and committed.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 12) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 13) Bill. Read a second time, and committed.

Education Board Provisional Orders (Cardiff and Newport (Monmouthshire) Bill (by Order). Second Reading deferred till To-morrow.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 8). Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade, under the Electric Lighting Acts, 1882 and 1888, relating to Caerphilly, Epsom Rural District (Cheam), Mansfield Woodhouse, North Worcestershire (Bromsgrove Urban), Stroud, Nailsworth and Durley, and Sutton-in-Ashfield, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Bonar Law and Mr. Gerald Balfour.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill. "To confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Electric Lighting Acts, 1882 and 1888, relating to Caerphilly, Epsom Rural District (Cheam), Mansfield Woodhouse, North Worcestershire (Bromsgrove Urban), Stroud, Nailsworth and Durley, and Sutton-in-Ashfield," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 198.]

Education Board Provisional Order (Swansea). Bill to confirm a Provisional Order made by the Board of Education, under Sections 17 (7) and 21 of The Education Act, 1902, relating to the County Borough of Swansea, ordered to be brought in by Sir William Anson and Mr. Victor Cavendish.

Education Board Provisional Order (Swansea) Bill. "To confirm a Provisional Order made by the Board of Education, under Sections 17 (7) and 21 of The Education Act, 1902, relating to the County Borough of Swansea," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 199.]

London County Council (Tramways and Improvements) Bill; Barnard Castle Gas Bill [Lords]. Reported, with Amendments; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

Govan Burgh (Electricity) Bill [Lords]. Reported, without Amendment; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time.

Skipton Water and Improvement Bill. Reported, with Amendments, from the Police and Sanitary Committee [Section A]; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to—Croydon Gas Bill, with Amendments.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confirm a Provisional Order made by the Board of Education under the Education Acts, 1870 to 1903, to enable the School Board for London to put in force the Lands Clauses Acts." [Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London) Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to empower the Portmadoc, Beddgelert, and South Snowdon Railway Company to construct new railways and to authorise agreements between that Company and the North Wales Narrow Gauge Railways Company; and for other purposes." [Portmadoc, Beddgelert, and South Snowdon Railway] Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confer further powers on the Corporation of Preston with reference to their water undertaking; and for other purposes." [Preston Corporation Water Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to empower the Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of the borough of Bournemouth to construct further tramways and to acquire the undertaking of the Tuckton Bridge Company; and for other purposes." [Bournemouth Corporation (Tramways) Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to enable the Mayor, Aldermen, and Citizens of the city and county of Newcastle-upon-Tyne to construct and work additional Tramways in and adjacent to the city; to widen existing streets; to construct new streets across and works in the Ouseburn Valley; to make a new quay; to acquire lands; to establish a superannuation fund; to raise further money; and to confer various further powers upon the Corporation in respect of their existing quays; and for other purposes." [Newcastle-upon-Tyne Corporation Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to empower the Alexandra (Newport and South Wales) Docks and Railway Company to extend their existing South Dock and to construct other works and to execute a diversion or straightening of the River Ebbw; for changing the name of the Company; and for other purposes." [Alexandra (Newport and South Wales) Docks and Railway Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to provide for the payment to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners and application by them of moneys payable under The City and South London Railway Act, 1896, by the City and South London Railway Company in respect of the church of St. Mary Woolnoth, in the City of London; and for other purposes. [St. Mary Woolnoth Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to authorise the making of tramways and tramroads in the city of Belfast and in the county of Down; and for other purposes." [Holywood Tramways Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act for empowering the North Wales Power and Traction Company, Limited, to construct generating stations and supply electricity in certain parts of North Wales; and for other purposes." [North Wales Electric Power Bill [Lords.]

And, also, a Bill, intituled "An Act to extend the city and county of Bristol; and for other purposes." [Bristol Corporation Bill [Lords.]

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London) Bill [Lords]. Read the first time; referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 200.]

Portmadoc, Beddgelert, and South Snowdon Railway Bill [Lords]; Preston

Corporation Water Bill [Lords]. Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

Bournemouth Corporation (Tramways) Bill [Lords]; Newcastle-upon-Tyne Corporation Bill [Lords]; Alexandra (Newport and South Wales) Docks and Railway Bill [Lords]; St. Mary Woolnoth Bill [Lords]; Holywood Tramways Bill [Lords]; North Wales Electric Power Bill [Lords]; Bristol Corporation Bill [Lords]. Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions for alteration; from Perth; Dingwall; Tain; and Glasgow; to lie upon the Table.

FINANCE BILL.

Petition from Greenock, against; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions against; from Dacre Banks; Heaton; Newcastle-on-Tyne; Tybie; Grantown; Castleton; Swansea (two); Manchester (four); Perth (three); Scarborough; Stirling; St. Ninians; Twerton-on-Avon; Frome (two); Bridport; Dunfermline; Ilkeston (two); Torquay (four); Sheffield; Newton St. Boswells; Eccles (two); Greenwich; Bolton (two); Whitwick (two); Weston-super-Mare; West Fife; Wells; Ludlow; Cardiff (ten); Govan (two); Wantage; Glasgow (nine); Derbyshire; Plumstead; Sunderland; Morecambe; Liverpool; Henley-on-Thames; Stourbridge; Wick; Fearn; Brinscall; Batley; Chiswick; Isle of Wight (three); Worcester; Rochdale; Westminster; Llywell; Cheam; Esher; Romford; Leytonstone; Angor Dyfi; Tain; Edinburgh (four); Urray; Muir; South West Riding of Yorkshire; Loughborough; Culbokie; Denton; Cromarty; Kirkcolm; Dartford; Knaresborough; Hugglescote; Bexley; Cupar; Tunbridge Wells; Ford; Malton; West Bristol; Tonbridge (two); Penistone; Laurencekirk; Boness; Gravesend; Great Ayton; Whitby and Darlington; Stonehaven; Long Buckby; Waterbeck; Thornhill; Chelsea; Felling; Jarrow-on-Tyne; Bristol (three); Burradon; Brighton; Alloa; Hebden Bridge; New Dock; Salford; Tillicoultry; Resolis; Cwmbran; Wishaw; Barmouth; Luton and Leighton; Torryburn; Greenock (two); South Manchester (two); East Holywell; Tudhoe; Llanelly (two); Market Lavington; Sawley; Higher Broughton; Guisborough; West Renfrew; Kilbarchan; Camberwell; Carris; Paisley (two); Galston; Baronhill; Muirkirk; South Ayrshire; Vale of Doon; Grangemouth; Denny; Stenhousemuir; Hornsey Road; Newport (Mon.); Banff; Peterhead; Elgin; Bexhill-on-Sea; Dundee (four); Crail; and Fochabers; to lie upon the Table.

LOCAL AUTHORITIES (QUALIFICATION OF WOMEN) BILL.

Petition from Battersea, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RATING OF MACHINERY BILL.

Petitions against; from Sheffield; and Atcham; to lie upon the Table.

RE-VACCINATION BILL.

Petitions against; from St. Giles; and Camberwell; to lie upon the Table.

RE-VACCINATION BILL.

Petitions in favour; from Stoke-upon-Trent; and Herefordshire County Council; to lie upon the Table.

TUBERCULOSIS (ANIMALS) COMPENSATION BILL.

Petition from Perth, against; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

MINES AND QUARRIES.

Copy presented, of General Report and Statistics for the year 1902, Part IV., Colonial and Foreign Statistics; Statistics relating to Persons employed, Output, and Accidents at Mines and Quarries in the British Colonies and in Foreign Countries [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

RAILWAY ACCIDENTS (GENERAL REPORT).

Copy presented, of General Report to the Board of Trade upon the Accidents that have occurred on the Railways of the United Kingdom during the year 1903 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

STATIONERY OFFICE (CONTROLLER'S REPORT).

Copy presented, of Fourth Report of the Controller of His Majesty's Stationery Office [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

ARKLOW HARBOUR.

Copy presented, of Report of the Arklow Harbour Commissioners and Statement of Accounts for 1903 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3061 to 3063 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

Union of Benefices Act (Saint John, Fitzroy Square, with Saint Saviour, Fitzroy Square). Copy of Scheme under The Union of Benefices Act, 1860, for effecting an Union of the Benefices of Saint John, Fitzroy Square, with Saint Saviour, Fitzroy Square [by Act].

EXPERIMENTS ON LIVING ANIMALS.

Address for "Return showing the number of Experiments performed on Living Animals during the year, 1903, under Licences granted under the Act 39 and 40 Vic., c. 77, distinguishing painless from painful Experiments (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 186, of Session 1903)."—(*Mr. Cochrane.*)

PUBLIC REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE (ROYAL NAVY).

Return ordered, "showing the Public Revenue and Expenditure; the total value of Imports and Exports (by sea); expenditure on, or contributions to, the cost of the provision and maintenance of the Royal Navy; and the percentage proportion such expenditure or contribution bears to the total Public Revenue and to the total value of Imports and Exports (by sea) in each of the various portions of the British Empire for the latest year for which figures are available, in the following form:—

India, Colonies, and Dependencies.	1.	2.	3.	4.	Percentage proportion.	
	Total Public Revenue.	Total Public Expenditure.	Total value of Imports and Exports (by sea), including bullion and specie.	Expenditure on, or contribution to, the provision and maintenance of the Royal Navy.	5. Expenditure on, or contribution to, the provision and maintenance of the Royal Navy bears to total Public Expenditure.	6. Expenditure on, or contribution to, the provision and maintenance of the Royal Navy bears to total value of Imports and Exports by sea.
India Self-governing Colonies						
Total India and Self-governing Colonies						
Other British Possessions						
Total other British Possessions						
		Abstract.				
India Self-governing Colonies Other British Possessions						
Total						
United Kingdom						

—(*Sir John Colomb.*)

CROWN AGENTS.

Address for "Return showing how many Firms were invited by the Crown Agents to tender for the supply of each of the following articles on the latest occasion within the last three years on which an order for considerable quantities of such articles was given by the crown agents—namely: Railway Rails, Steel Sleepers, Steel Bridges, Locomotives, Railway Trucks, Railway Carriages, Electric Cranes, Steam Cranes, Corrugated Iron, Iron Pipes, Cement, Telegraph Wire, Electric Cables, Telegraph Insulators, Machinery for Electric Lighting, Engine Coal, Rifles, Cartridges, and Harness."—(*Mr. Herbert Samuel.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Longworth Estate, County Galway.

Mr. ROCHE (Galway, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Congested Districts Board have purchased the Longworth Estate in the county of Galway; and, if so, will he direct that the holdings of those adjoining, whose valuation does not exceed £8, shall be enlarged.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The Longworth Estate has been purchased by the Board for the benefit of congested districts in county Galway. The Board has not yet investigated the circumstances of the small holdings adjoining the estate.

Sale of Estates in County Kerry.

Mr. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state how many landlords in Kerry have sold or agreed to sell their estates under the Land Act of 1903; what are their names; and what is the valuation, rental, purchase price, and number of tenants of each estate.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The following Return gives the desired information:—

Estate.	Valuation.			Rental.			Purchase Money	No. of Tenants.
	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.		
Buckley, Thomas . . .	16	5	0	17	16	0	399	1
Maxwell, Annie . . .	41	10	0	24	0	0	518	2
Julian, Jas. Ed. J. . .	329	15	0	373	6	6	7,701	15
De Moleyns, Townsend Armberg	305	10	0	244	16	8	5,883	9
Horan, Timothy . . .	65	5	0	103	6	6	2,100	5
Leahy, J. W. . . .	128	0	0	160	0	0	3,85	1
Total . .	886	5	0	923	5	8	20,451	33

Alleged Illegal Arrest by the British North Borneo Company.

Mr. HENNIKER HEATON (Canterbury): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he will state whether His Majesty's Government has any control over the Chartered Company of British North Borneo; whether he is aware that on 30th December last certain officers of the company, including a magistrate, visited the estate of Mr. J. C. Robertson, at Mempakul, for the alleged purpose of capturing runaway Chinese coolies, and that the party fired upon and wounded one of Mr. Robertson's workmen named Li Min; that Mr. Robertson, on the 31st December, represented the facts to the magistrate, who replied that if he found anyone spreading such rumours he would have him severely punished; that Mr. Robertson represented the facts in a letter, dated 4th February last, addressed to the High Commissioner at Singapore, who forwarded a copy of Mr. Robertson's complaint to the Acting Governor of British North Borneo; and that Li Min has been arrested by the British North Borneo authorities and put in gaol; and, if so, whether the Foreign Office will take steps to have Li Min released, if he is still in custody, and compensated for his injuries, arrest, and detention.

(*Answered by Earl Percy.*) The control exercisable by His Majesty's Government over the British North Borneo Company is defined in the Company's Charter of 8th November, 1881, to which I would refer the hon. Member. Article 10 of the Charter deals with the treatment of the inhabitants of the territory generally. His Majesty's Government have had no report with regard to the case referred to, but will at once communicate with the High Commissioner for the Straits Settlements on the matter.

Naturalisation Fees.

Mr. SHACKLETON (Lancashire, Clitheroe): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been drawn to the question of naturalisation fees paid by workmen coming into this country; whether he is aware that the present fee is £5; and, considering the low rate of wages generally earned by this class of people, whether he can see his way to reduce the present naturalisation fee to £2 instead of £5.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) The question of the amount of the fee which ought to be charged for naturalisation certificates has been frequently reviewed by myself and my predecessors, but the conclusion reached has always been that the present fee of £5 is a proper one, and that no sufficient ground (*e.g.*, that it operates to prevent desirable persons from obtaining the privileges of British nationality) has been shown for reducing it. I am not in possession of any facts which would lead me to alter that view.

Fountains in Kensington Gardens.

Mr. COGHILL (Stoke-upon-Trent): To ask the hon. Member for Chorley, as representing the First Commissioner of Works, if he can state what is the reason why the fountains at the Bayswater end of the Long Water in Kensington Gardens are not playing; and whether he is aware that it is now more than eighteen months since they last played.

(*Answered by Lord Balcarres.*) The stoppage of the fountains was occasioned by the renewal and reconstruction of the boiler and pumping plant at the engine station at the head of the lake. They were stopped, I am informed, in June last year, but were going for a fortnight at Easter. It is expected that they will be at work again in the course of the summer.

Increased Salaries for Postal Officials at Hastings.

Mr. FREEMAN-THOMAS (Hastings): To ask the Postmaster-General if he will state what increase has been or will be made in the maximum salaries of the postmaster, chief clerk, superintendent, and the assistant superintendents of the Hastings Post Office, in consequence of the recent increase in the number of the sorting clerks and telegraphists' staff at that office.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) The maximum pay of the chief clerk and superintendent at Hastings has recently been increased by £20 a year in each case, and the maximum of the assistant superintendents has been raised by £10 a year. The revision of the postmaster's salary will not be due for some time yet.

Postal Collections—Weight conveyed by one man on a truck

Mr. FREEMAN-THOMAS: To ask the Postmaster-General if he will state what weight is one postman required to take when on a collection with a truck.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) There is no hard and fast rule. The weight to be conveyed by one man with a handcart depends upon various circumstances, such as, for instance, the distance to be travelled and the nature of the road.

Sorting of Parcels at St. Leonards-on-Sea Post Office

Mr. FREEMAN-THOMAS: To ask the Postmaster-General whether his attention has been called to a petition, sent to the postmaster of Hastings on 3rd October last, having reference to the arrangements made for the sorting of parcels at the St. Leonards-on-Sea Post Office; and if he will cause inquiries to be made into the matter.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) My attention has not previously been called to the petition to which the hon. Member refers, but I will cause inquiry to be made.

Recommendations of Eastern Mail Service Committee.

MR. EVELYN CECIL (Aston Manor): To ask the Postmaster-General what steps have been taken to give effect to any of the recommendations made in the Report of the Eastern Mail Service Committee.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) I have already arranged with the Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Company to continue their present service for three years after the expiration of the current contract on 31st of January, 1905, but with an acceleration of 24 hours on every section of it both in the outward and homeward direction. For this increase of speed the Company will receive an addition of £10,000 a year to their annual subsidy of £330,000, and during the three years for which this arrangement is to remain in force it will be ascertained whether further improvements can be obtained by open tender. But I have also procured from the Peninsular and Oriental Company the option of prolonging the arrangement for two or four additional years if circumstances should at any time make a further extension desirable. If the prolongation is made for two years only the subsidy for the whole period of five years will be £330,000, but if the arrangement is maintained for seven years in all the subsidy for the whole period will be at the rate of £315,000 a year.

Navy Pensions.

SIR CARNE RASCH (Essex, Chelmsford): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he is aware that the Greenwich Pensions do not provide for more than a third of the applicants over 65 years of age; and, if so, will he consider the advisability of assimilating the Army and Navy system of pensions for campaign service.

(*Answered by Mr. Pretyman.*) The shortage referred to in the first part of the Question does not arise in the case of Greenwich Special Pensions, but in that of the age pensions to men over 55 years of age. Up to the present time no difficulty has been experienced in providing Greenwich Hospital Special Pensions to applicants who are 65 years old or more, who have a war medal, and are in necessitous circumstances.

General Officers for Indian Establishment.

SIR CARNE RASCH: To ask the Secretary of State for India whether the list of general officers for the Indian etablishment is made up; and, if not, when the vacancies will be filled.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) There is an establishment of generals for the Indian Army which is at present full. Under the Royal Warrant, except during a period of war, the maximum number of lieutenant-generals is five, and of major-generals 22. The actual number is governed by the number of promotions to these ranks necessary to fill appointments by selection or as a reward for distinguished service.

Salaries of Irish National School Teachers.

MR. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will explain why the Commissioners of National Education have granted to some principal teachers, appointed for the first time on or after the 1st of April, 1900, salaries largely in excess of the initial salary, while other teachers similarly circumstanced are denied any such increase.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) It is not practicable to reply to a Question of this general character. If the hon. Member will communicate to me the particulars of a specific case I shall be happy to make inquiry and to communicate to him the result.

Sale of Intoxicants to Chinese Labourers in South African Mines.

Captain ELLICE (St. Andrews Burghs): To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether any arrangement has been arrived at with Lord Milner with regard to the sale of intoxicants to the Chinese labourers who are to be employed in the South African Mines.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Lyttelton.*) I have not yet been informed by Lord Milner of the arrangements which will be made, but I have reminded him by telegraph.

Wages of Chinese Labourers in South Africa.

Mr. WHITLEY (Halifax): To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he can now state what provision has been made in the regulations controlling the recruiting of Chinese coolies to ensure that they shall be paid a rate of wages not less than that now received by the Transvaal natives.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Lyttelton.*) The following are the terms of the wages clause inserted in the contract: Any labourer employed at labour to which piece-work is not applicable shall be paid for the work on which he is employed at the rates detailed by Chamber of Mines Schedule of Native Pay, May, 1897, restored January, 1903. If, however, within six months from the date of the said labourers' arrival in the Witwatersrand district the average pay of the labourers employed under the said Ordinance does not equal 50s. for thirty working days the rate shall be increased from 1s. to 1s. 6d. for each working day of 10 hours. The schedule of native pay referred to will be found at p. 151 of [Cd. 2025]. The majority will be employed on piece-work, and will, I am assured, be in a position to earn about 50s. for thirty days' work, which is, I am informed, the average wage of the Kaffir at the mines. The Papers which have been laid will contain fuller information on the subject.

Resumed Consideration of New Rules of Procedure.

Mr. WHITLEY: To ask the First Lord of the Treasury when he proposes to resume consideration of the new Rules of Procedure, which were left in an unfinished state two years ago.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) I am afraid I have nothing to add to the Answer I gave on 3rd May to the Question of the hon. Member for Cirencester.†

———

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

———

Army Reorganisation.

Mr. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydvil): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he will invite the attention of the Committee now examining the recommendations of the Esher Committee for the re-arrangement of the military commands and administrative districts within the United Kingdom, to consider the expediency of creating a separate command for South Wales and Monmouthshire.

*The SECRETARY of STATE for WAR (Mr. Arnold-Forster, Belfast, W.): The recommendations of the Committee to which the hon. Member refers are now under the consideration of the Army Council. The system proposed by Lord Esher's Committee involves the grouping for administrative purposes of four regimental depots into a brigade or sub-district, and if this be adopted it will not permit of the establishment of a separate one including only South Wales and Monmouthshire.

Rock Drilling in Metalliferous Mines.

Dr. HUTCHINSON (Sussex, Rye): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if his attention has been drawn to the observations of Dr. Haldane at an inquest held on a Cornish miner at Bisson, to the effect that rock drill is dangerous and should be done by use of the water jet; and, if so, will he take steps to make the use of the water jet compulsory in all metalliferous mines in the Transvaal.

The SECRETARY of STATE for the COLONIES (Mr. Lyttelton, Warwick and Leamington): I have not seen

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxxxiv., 268.

Dr. Haldane's observations referred to, but I have read an interesting paper by Mr. Francis Fox, M.I.C.E., on this subject, and I also learn from the Home Office that the inquiry which has been made into miners' phthisis in Cornwall by Dr. Haldane, Mr. Martin, and Mr. Thomas, is now completed, and that their report, which deals with the precautions to be observed in the use of rock drills, will be issued very shortly. I shall at once bring it to the notice of the Transvaal Government. I would at the same time point out that this subject has for some time engaged the earnest attention of the Transvaal Chamber of Mines, who have offered prizes for the best practical suggestions and devices for dealing with the matter.

Proposed Jewish Settlement in East Africa.

MR. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he will appoint an independent Commission to inquire into and report on the suggested cession of territory to an alien race in East Africa.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Earl PERCY, Kensington, S.): There would, in the opinion of the Secretary of State, be no advantage in appointing a Commission; no cession of territory is contemplated. The conditions of the lease to the Jewish Colonial Trust are under discussion.

MR. CATHCART WASON: I shall call attention to this matter on the Motion to adjourn for the holidays.

Railway Rates on General Merchandise.

MR. CROMBIE (Kincardineshire): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he will appoint a Departmental Committee to inquire into the same questions concerning the railway rates on general merchandise which are engaging the attention of a Committee appointed by the President of the Board of Agriculture, in respect of agricultural produce.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): The answer to the hon. Member's Question is in the negative.

Motor-Cycles in the West End.

MR. CATHCART WASON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the speed at which motorcycles are driven in the neighbourhood of Trafalgar Square and Pall Mall; and, if so, will he instruct the police to prosecute the offenders.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's): I have not had my attention drawn to this particular matter, and I am informed by the police that they have neither noticed personally, nor received complaints as to cases of motor-cycles being driven in the neighbourhood indicated at such speeds as to be a matter for prosecution. The police have full instructions as to enforcing the provisions of the Motor Car Act and any rules thereunder.

Sievier v. Duke.

MR. ATHERLEY-JONES (Durham, N.W.) I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the fact that, in the recent case of Sievier *v.* Duke, a police constable of the Metropolitan force gave evidence that one of the litigants was in his opinion a person of evil reputation; by whose authority or instruction he was permitted to give such evidence, and whether he received from any person, and, if so, whom, any reward or gratuity for attending the court as a witness; whether he has sanctioned the practice of a police constable appearing in a civil cause between private litigants to express opinions as to the character and reputation of one litigant at the instance and on behalf of the other litigant; and, if not, whether he will censure those responsible for permitting the officer to give such evidence, and take steps to prevent the recurrence of such conduct.

*MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS: The officer in question attended to give evidence in obedience to a *subpœna*, and, I am informed, received ordinary conduct money only. The police authorities had no power to forbid him to obey the order of the Court and I am, therefore, not prepared to pass any censure on them in the matter. I am not aware that there exists any such practice as that suggested in the Question, and I certainly should be the last to encourage it.

Railway Rates for Fish.

Mr. CROMBIE: I beg to ask the hon. Member for North Huntingdonshire, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether the Departmental Committee appointed to inquire into the question of railway rates for agricultural produce will include in its inquiries the rates for carriage of fish.

Mr. AILWYN FELLOWES (Huntingdonshire, Ramsey): We fully recognise the importance of the question of the rates charged for the carriage of fish by rail, and any representations which we may receive on the subject will be carefully investigated by our inspectors. But it would not be possible to extend the work of Lord Jersey's Committee in the manner proposed. The composition of the Committee would require to be considerably altered, and it was appointed, moreover, solely for the purpose of investigating the question of the alleged preferential treatment of foreign and colonial as compared with British produce—a question which scarcely arises in the case of fish.

Old Admiralty Buildings.

Sir JOHN LENG (Dundee): I beg to ask the hon. Member for Chorley, as representing the First Commissioner of Works, why part of the old Admiralty buildings is being taken down; whether the rest of the structure has been condemned as uninhabitable and whether it is intended to erect on the site a new office for one of the Government Departments.

Lord BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley): The only part of the old Admiralty buildings to be taken down is a wall facing the Horse Guards Parade which is to be rebuilt to correspond with the west wing. The answer to the second paragraph is in the negative. Additional accommodation is to be provided for the Admiralty in the new wing which is is now under course of construction.

Sanitary Condition of Derrygonnelly.

Mr. EDWARD MITCHELL (Fermanagh, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the sanitary and sewerage condition of Derrygonnelly, county Fermanagh, is in a dangerous condition to the health of the inhabitants, and that the medical and sanitary officers for the district have reported on the insanitary state of the village, and brought the matter to the notice of the Local Government Board; and, if so, if he will direct that immediate steps be taken to remedy this state of affairs.

The CHIEF SECRETARY for IRELAND (Mr. Wyndham, Dover.): The defective sanitary condition of Derrygonnelly has engaged the attention of the Board, who have urged the rural district council to proceed with the necessary sewerage works, but so far without effect. Section 15 of the Public Health Act, 1896, provides, however, that where a formal complaint is made to the Board that the sanitary authority has made default in this respect, the Board if satisfied, after due inquiry, that such default has been established, shall enforce the performance of its duty by the local authority. The attention of the council has been drawn to this enactment.

Commissioners of Education in Ireland — Land Purchase.

Mr. MURPHY (Kerry, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if, having regard to the statement made in the Report of the Commissioners of Education in Ireland, just issued, that the offers made by their tenants in Ireland were refused because they were inadequate, he can furnish a Return showing the rental, the receipts, and expenses in connection with these estates, and the offers made by the tenants on each estate, in order that the statement may be examined; whether he can induce the Commissioners to arrive at terms immediately in the interests of the tenants, and whether he can tell how much the rents on these estates have been reduced in the last year and in the last fifteen years owing to the rent-fixing provisions of the said Acts.

MR. WYNDHAM: This question has been referred to the Commissioners, by whom it will be considered at their meeting on Thursday next. The result of that consideration will be communicated to the hon. Member.

Lloyd-Apjohn Estate, County Limerick.

MR. LUNDON (Limerick, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can say what progress has been made with the sale of the estate of the late Michael Marshall Lloyd-Apjohn, in the parish of Nicker, and county of Limerick, which has been for a long time in the Land Judge's Court; whether the Receiver to the estate has made any offer or terms of sale to the tenants, or have the tenants offered any terms for purchase; or is there any probability of an immediate arrangement.

MR. WYNDHAM: In February the Land Judge authorised the Receiver to negotiate with the tenants with a view to the sale of holdings. Negotiations have been entered into and are at present in progress.

Agricultural Labourers in Ireland.

MR. LUNDON: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland will he say (1) how much money which might have been utilised by the district councils in Ireland in the interests of the agricultural labourers is remaining over from the Local Government (Ireland) Grant; and (2) will this money in the future be applied to the purposes for which it was intended; (3) will he give the names of the various district councils which have exhausted the poundage allowed them under the Labourers Acts to the amount of 10d in the pound; and (4) can he say whether he will make provision in the Labourers Bill at present before the House for supplying the second plots for the labourers in the unions in which the limit of 1s. in the pound on the valuation has been already reached.

MR. WYNDHAM: In reply to the first and third inquiries, I refer to the House of Commons Return No. 198 of the Session of 1903. The question of the application of the unexpended balance is under consideration. In answer to the fourth inquiry, it is not proposed to increase the present maximum rating limit of 1s. in the pound.

Kerry Fisheries.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the number of congested electoral divisions in the Parliamentary Division of North Kerry; how many are inland and how many on the sea coast; and whether he can state how much money has been spent by the Congested Districts Board on the inland congested divisions, and also how much money on the seaboard divisions for the development and improvement of the several fisheries for each of the years from 1897 to 1903 inclusive.

MR. WYNDHAM: A list of the scheduled electoral divisions will be found in the Board's First Annual Report. The accounts of the Board do not show its expenditure by electoral divisions, but by counties. The Board has expended £22,077 on piers and roads in the county; £18,300 on agricultural schemes; and loans amounting to £13,978 have been made for fishery purposes. Detailed information in respect of all these matters is set forth in the yearly Reports of the Board.

MR. FLAVIN: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that there are eleven congested divisions in North Kerry, and although numerous applications have been made to the Congested Districts Board on behalf of the fishing industries they have not spent a single penny there.

MR. WYNDHAM said the question was before the Board. He was not aware that money had been asked for for that purpose.

MR. FLAVIN: I can assure the right hon. Gentleman that many applications have been made.

Irish Fishing Industry Return.

MR. FLAVIN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will grant the Return in connection with the fishing industry in Ireland standing on to-day's Paper.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The information indicated in the Return will be found in Part 1 of the Report of the Fisheries Branch of the Department for 1902.

Mr. JOYCE (Limerick): Would it not be better to give this Return? It is most important it should be in the hands of Members.

Mr. WYNDHAM: There is a Return available, and I do not think anything is to be gained by multiplying Returns.

Mr. FLAVIN: What is its date?

Mr. WYNDHAM: The Report of 1902.

Appended is the Return referred to:—

Return showing, in respect of the fishery industry in Ireland, the opening and closing dates for rod and net fishing, in the following form:—

Name of river.	County or counties through which the river flows.	Opening date for Rod fishing.	Closing date for Rod fishing.	Opening date for Net fishing.	Closing date for Net fishing.

Listowel and Tarbert Coach Contract.

Mr. FLAVIN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state what the contract price per year is for the coach service between Listowel and Tarbert; and whether he will explain why, when the contract was entered into, tenders were not invited from people living in Listowel and Tarbert.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The contract price for the coach service was £600 a year. Tenders were originally invited by advertisements published in the Dublin and provincial newspapers, and, as a matter of fact, were received from both Listowel and Tarbert.

Mr. FLAVIN: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that a service which now costs £650 could be carried out by local people for half that amount, and, if so, will he consider the question?

* Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order!

Mr. FLAVIN: Am I not entitled to point out to the right hon. Gentleman that an amount of public money is being wasted?

* Mr. SPEAKER: Certainly not on a Question. The proper time is the Estimate.

Royal Irish Constabulary.

Mr. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will state what reduction has taken place in the number of men in the Royal Irish Constabulary force, from January, 1884, to January, 1904, and also the reduction in the officers for same period.

Mr. WYNDHAM: Twenty officers and 3,021 head and other constables.

Royal Irish Constabulary Cadets.

Mr. DELANY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state whether District Inspectors Hodge and Richardson, of the Royal Irish Constabulary Depot, are at present on leave; and, if so, for how long; whether those officers are drawing their full pay and allowances while on leave; and, if so, how much per month; and under what circumstances those officers have applied for leave.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The two gentlemen referred to are cadets at the depôt. They returned to the depôt from leave of absence on the 12th inst. Whilst on leave they drew their pay at the rate of £6 5s. 8d. per month. They are not in receipt of any allowances.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): Can the right hon. Gentleman say anything as to the business which will be taken when the House resumes?

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): The Revenue Votes 1 and 2 will be taken on Tuesday when the House meets after the Whitsuntide holidays. The House may discuss on Wednesday the Anglo-French Agreement on the Second Reading of the Bill which deals with that part of the subject. Supply will be taken on Thursday, and on Friday some of the smaller Bills will be taken.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis: Shall we be able to discuss the whole Anglo-French Agreement on a Bill which deals with only part of it?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The Bill can only deal with a part of the Agreement, but I understand that there will be no difficulty in taking on that part, which is an integral part, and in that sense the part which involves the whole, a discussion in its broader aspect.

SIR WALTER FOSTER (Derbyshire, Ilkeston): Will the right hon. Gentleman define the smaller Bills for Friday?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: My hon. friend the Member for the Wellington Division of Somerset gives me a specimen—Penal Servitude and Dogs.

NEW BILLS.

ALKALI, ETC., WORKS BILL.

"To consolidate and amend the Alkali, etc., Works Regulation Acts, 1881 and 1892," presented by Mr. Walter Long; supported by the Lord Advocate, Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland, and Mr. Grant Lawson: to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 1st June, and to be printed. [Bill 202.]

NAVAL WORKS (PORTSMOUTH BARRACKS SITE) BILL.

"For vesting in the Admiralty certain lands at Portsmouth, with the church and buildings thereon, for the purpose of, or in connection with, the erection of barracks, and for other matters incidental thereto," presented by Mr. Arthur Lee; supported by Mr. Pretyman; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 1st June, and to be printed. [Bill 201.]

DEAN FOREST BILL.

"To facilitate the opening and working of certain of the lower series of Coal Seams in His Majesty's Forest of Dean, and in the hundred of St. Briavels, in the county of Gloucester, and for certain other purposes connected with the mines in the said forest and hundred," presented by Mr. Victor Cavendish; supported by Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 1st June, and to be printed. [Bill 203.]

ARCHITECTS' REGISTRATION BILL.

"To provide for the registration of architects," presented by Mr. Atherley-Jones; supported by Sir William Coddington, Mr. Wallace, and Sir Christopher Furness; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 1st June, and to be printed. [Bill 204.]

ANGLO-FRENCH CONVENTION BILL.

"For approving and carrying into effect a Convention between His Majesty and the President of the French Republic," presented by Earl Percy; supported by Mr. A. J. Balfour and Mr. Secretary Lyttelton; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 1st June, and to be printed. [Bill 205.]

POOR LAW OFFICERS SUPERANNUATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

"To provide Superannuation Allowances to Poor Law Officers and Servants in Scotland, and for contributions towards such Allowances by such Officers and Servants; and to make other relative provisions," presented by Mr. Maxwell; supported by Sir William Arrol, Sir Lewis McIver, Dr. Farquharson, Mr. Alexander Cross, Colonel Denny, Mr. Ure, and Sir Charles Renshaw; to be read a second time upon Monday, 4th July, and to be printed. [Bill 206.]

HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES (RURAL DISTRICTS) BILL.

"To amend The Housing of the Working Classes Act, 1890, and the Acts amending the same, and the Local Government Act, 1894, so as to facilitate the provision of cottages by rural district councils," presented by Sir Walter Foster; supported by Mr. Channing, Mr. Stevenson, Mr. Pirie, Mr. Broadhurst, Mr. Frederick Wilson, Mr. Herbert Samuel, and Mr. Soames; to be read a second time upon Monday, 6th June, and to be printed. [Bill 207.]

MONUMENT TO THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I rise with, I believe, the general concurrence of hon. Gentlemen in all parts of the House to move this national recognition to a man who held the office of Prime Minister, I believe, for a longer time than any one who has served the Crown in that capacity since the great Reform Bill. When a vote similar to this was proposed on the last two occasions it was proposed by a Leader of the House differing in politics and often brought into political conflict with the statesmen to whom it was desired to do honour. That position was not without difficulty to the mover, yet I am not sure it was not easier than the one which falls to me; for I am perhaps hampered in saying all that comes into my thoughts on such a subject not merely by political agreement, but by personal relationship, and by a connection, a close connection, in politics which dates from my earliest political experience; since, indeed, I do not think that I should ever have been a Member of this House had it not been for Lord Salisbury's advice and influence. That does not make it easier for me to attempt with that impartiality of spirit which befits the occasion to recommend this Vote to the House.

The task, difficult in itself, difficult from its accompanying circumstances, is certainly not made easier for any man who desires to give a portrait of the late Lord Salisbury by the difficulties inherent in the subject. The three great statesmen, Lord Beaconsfield, Mr. Gladstone, and Lord Salisbury, who have within living memory been the subject of such a Vote as this, not only differed from each other to a degree which it is difficult to exaggerate, but were in themselves, I think, men very hard to classify. It may be that the perspective of time makes a difference; but I should not have said the same, for instance, of Sir Robert Peel, of Lord Palmerston, or of Lord Russell. They seem to fall more easily into the ordinary categories of description and criticism—That is no condemnation of them, far from it; but Lord Beaconsfield, Mr. Gladstone, and Lord Salisbury were all men struck in so particular and special a mould that it is very difficult for any of the great artists, even with unlimited opportunities before him, to present to his fellow-countrymen a living portrait of the manner of men they were. And perhaps it is most difficult in the case of Lord Salisbury, because Lord Salisbury was by nature reticent. I have never known him to speak of himself. He seldom, even in practical life, gave a reason for or against any course of action which went beyond the actual needs of the moment; and where other men revealed themselves in easy generalities, he was apt to illuminate the subject with, but to shroud himself behind, some brilliant epigram. There was also a peculiarity which I think he possessed more than any man I have ever known—a certain self-contained simplicity which made it not easy for other men quite to understand him. It would be most unfair, I think, to say of Lord Beaconsfield that he was theatrical; but it would not be unfair to say that he had no objection to a picturesque or dramatic situation in which he was an important figure. It would be most unfair to say of Mr. Gladstone that he was greedy of popular applause; yet, rightly, I think, he I am sure was moved by the fervour of popular admiration which his genius was so eminently fitted to elicit. Lord Salisbury was, I believe, absolutely without any feelings of that kind at all. For good or for evil — and I do not say that it was wholly for good — he was completely indifferent to popular applause, or to applause of any kind, popular or otherwise; and that is so apart from the ordinary feelings, or it may sometimes be the weaknesses, of humanity that it makes his portraiture very difficult to draw.

And there was another reason which must stand in the way of any man moving this Vote. It is that to the present generation his House of Commons life is now merely a matter of history. A few there are, but a very few, who knew him in the culminating period of his House of Commons career, when by dint of sheer debating ability he had won his way to the very forefront of Parliamentary statesmen. But he was almost immediately carried away by what he regarded as an unhappy accident of birth to another place; and he so profoundly felt the loss that, if the story that we have always believed be true, although there was many a notable battle fought across the floor of this House in which his opinions, his convictions, and his Government were at stake, never once could he bring himself to watch from that gallery the contest in which he was born to be a protagonist. And yet, Mr. Speaker, it is a singular reflection to make that had Lord Salisbury been able to have his way, had he indeed remained what he was born to be, an ornament of the debates of this House, it would have been quite impossible for him to have been Foreign Minister through all the long and troubled years during which he directed our foreign policy: for that most laborious Department can never be filled, in my judgment, by any man who does his work both in his office and in this House. I think, therefore, that, however great the loss may have been to him. the gain to the nation from the change was great. I admit that it is impossible to form a full and fair judgment of the foreign policy of any statesman until his career be run and until the secret documents by which alone he can be judged become common property. There are bold individuals who write the history of their own time. But those histories, however great their literary skill, can, unless the writer have access to special information, have but little interest for posterity; and what is true of domestic history is doubly true of the history of international relations. It is not until the Chancelleries of Europe have given up to future historians their secrets, it is not until the controversies in which we have been engaged have lost all living interest and have become the property of the student and the historian, that our children will be able to judge how great was the part played by Lord Salisbury, and how beneficent was the part he played in the foreign history of this country. And yet, Sir, I think it is by a sound instinct that men of all Parties, though they have differed, and may yet differ, from this or that action of Lord Salisbury as Prime Minister and as Foreign Secretary—it is by a sound instinct that both the House and the country regarded him with great confidence as a man earnestly desirous of maintaining the honour of his country, and not less desirous of maintaining the peace of the world, zealously bent on combining those two surely not antagonistic interests. Therefore, it is, Sir, that with some confidence I ask the House, in the traditional terms which time has consecrated to occasions like this, to express the national gratitude for Lord Salisbury's services. Certainly this I will say, with universal concurrence, that never did any man bring to the service of his country an intellect of greater distinction, and never did any man spend himself in that service with more single-minded and whole-hearted devotion.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty praying that His Majesty will give directions that a Monument be erected in the Collegiate Church of St. Peter, Westminster, to the memory of the late right hon. the Marquess of Salisbury, with an inscription expressive of the high sense entertained by the House of his rare and splendid gifts and of his devoted labours in Parliament and in great Offices of State; and to assure His Majesty that this House will make good the expenses attending the same." (*Mr. A. J. Balfour.*)

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): Sir, so eloquent, so full, and so deeply interesting has been the speech with which the Prime Minister has commended this Resolution to the House, that if I obeyed my natural instinct I should say nothing except formally to express my concurrence in the Resolution. The right hon. Gentleman has spoken with the fulness of knowledge derived, as he said, not only from close political connection, but from still closer personal association with Lord Salisbury, and the tribute he has paid to the character of Lord Salisbury, I think, will remain a treasured possession of this House. The right hon. Gentleman has referred to the two previous occasions of recent years when a similar Motion was made in this House. In the case of Lord Beaconsfield, and again in that of Mr. Gladstone, the monument proposed was to be erected in order to perpetuate the memory, or to assist in perpetuating the memory, of a House of Commons man, of a statesman who had passed the greater part or the whole of his career in this House, whose personality was familiar to its Members, and who in each case had through many years earned a title not only to our admiration and gratitude, but to our personal regard, and I would almost say affection. It is not so, as the right hon. Gentleman has said, with Lord Salisbury. He quitted his place in this Chamber thirty-six years ago, and the greater and more prominent and more brilliant part of his public life was spent in the other House. In fact, to most Members of this House he was personally unknown. Not the less on that account are we able and willing to recognise the greatness of his services and of his qualities. Sir, Lord Salisbury's exalted character, his honesty of purpose, his independence of thought, his broad views, and his steadfast devotion to duty won him the regard and the confidence of men of all shades of opinion. Even those of us — in my humble way I am speaking for them— who on proper occasion differed from him in policy were always proud of him. High as the position was which he occupied in this country and in the world, we knew and had perfect confidence that its lustre would not be dimmed or its power for good misused in the hands of Lord Salisbury. The House of Commons, Sir, does well now to seek to give outward form to a feeling which we all share, and therefore I cordially support the Resolution.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): I need scarcely say I am sure that it would be a very pleasant task to join with the two right hon. Gentlemen in commending this Vote to the House, and on the other hand, to raise a discordant note upon an occasion such as this must be distasteful to any man. But I feel that I should not be fulfilling my duty, in fact I feel that I should be guilty of cowardice, if I did not in a few words, and with as much consideration as possible for the natural feelings of hon. Members on both sides of this House, give expression to what I believe to be the view entertained by the Nationalist representatives of Ireland on this occasion. If I were a British Member of the House of Commons I would join heartily in supporting this Vote. It is, I think, one of the glorious traditions of this House that British Members of various Parties, notwithstanding bitter differences over political questions, can all unite to do honour to those who are the great men of their race; and I admit to the full that Lord Salisbury was one of the great men of the British race. Intellectually he was undoubtedly a great man, and by his statesmanship and his labour undoubtedly he has earned the respect and honour of the British people. But, Sir, this is another instance, if I may be allowed to say so, of how wide a chasm there is between the Nationalist representatives of Ireland and the rest of the House of Commons. We are in this House, but not of this House. We are here against our will. We are here for the purpose of making an hourly protest against the abolition of our own legislative liberties. We have never felt ourselves really as a part of the House of Commons; and on an occasion such as this we are bound, therefore, to give expression, as moderately as possible and with as little desire to give offence as possible—we are bound to give expression to the views we entertain. I can quite understand the speech of the Leader of the Opposition. Lord Salisbury is to him, just as to Members on the other side of the House, a great figure in British history. What was he for us? He was a man, Sir, who all through his career was the consistent and the vehement opponent of every extension of the liberties of the Irish people. He opposed the concession of the franchise to the Irish people; he opposed the land policy, the Land Act of 1881, which undoubtedly brought safety to the property of the Irish tenant and peace to a large portion of the country; he opposed during many long years any extension of local government in Ireland, and in discussing that very question of local government in Ireland he used a phrase which still rankles in our minds, when he compared the Irish race, and their fitness for self-government, to the race of the Hottentots. Now, in these circumstances we, I think, will not be misunderstood if we say, as I say on behalf of my colleagues, that we do not, that we cannot, associate ourselves with the project in this Resolution. Mr. Chairman, I think that it is but the least that we can do to make this concession to the feeling on both sides of the House—we will not divide against this Motion. But I must be allowed, in the name of my colleagues, to say that we dissociate ourselves altogether from this project, that we do not share in what the Prime Minister called the national gratitude to Lord Salisbury, and that we cannot by our silence allow this Vote to be represented hereafter as the unanimous wish of an Assembly which contains against their will a number of representatives of the Nationalist feeling of the Irish people.

SIR ALFRED THOMAS (Glamorganshire, E.): Mr. Chairman, on behalf of my colleagues, I beg to join my right hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition in the sentiments which he has expressed with so much grace and felicity. We Welsh people are very fond of triads; and that may be one reason why I always associate the names of Gladstone, Beaconsfield, and Salisbury, as the three giants of the later Victorian Era. It is hardly necessary for me to say that the political views of the late illustrious statesman did not accord with those of our people, from whom he claimed origin and ancestry; yet I question whether in any part of this vast Empire his memory will be held in higher regard and esteem than in Wales. In common with all, we know how much we were indebted to him when at a grave crisis he succeeded in soothing the wounded susceptibilities of a highly susceptible nation. Lord Salisbury was a man who neither feared contumely nor courted applause. He was a great personality and a highly-minded Christian gentleman.

COLONEL SAUNDERSON (Armagh, N.): The hon. and learned Member for Waterford spoke in the name of the Irish race.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: No, in the name of the Nationalist representatives in this House.

COLONEL SAUNDERSON: I wish to say that there is another Ireland—in whose name I claim to speak. The memory of Lord Salisbury to us is an Imperial memory, a memory which, of course, does not appeal to the hon. Member for Waterford. To us Lord Salisbury was a great Englishman, a great Imperialist; and he did more, in our estimation, to consolidate the British Empire than, perhaps, any other statesman of the last generation. I can only say, on behalf of those I represent in Ireland, who are not a very small fraction of the Irish people—I know that I am speaking in their name—that we revere Lord Salisbury's memory and look back upon his political action as connected with the welfare not only of the Empire at large, but of Ireland as well. My views and those of hon. Gentlemen opposite undoubtedly are different. The hon. Member for Waterford says there is a chasm which separates us. Well, I believe that Lord Salisbury hoped that the day might come when that chasm might be bridged. I can only say for my part, and on behalf of my colleagues, that we also look forward to the day when that chasm spoken of by the hon. Member for Waterford may no longer exist, and when Irishmen of all classes and creeds may unite with me and those I represent in connecting Ireland with the great Empire of which it forms a part. It is not simply as an Irishman, but as something higher still to my view than even an Irishman, and that is as a subject of the head of this great Empire, connected as we are with the Empire, without which we should be but a miserable waif among the nations of the world, that I revere Lord Salisbury's memory and heartily endorse the proposal to erect a monument to his name.

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolved, That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty praying that His Majesty will give directions that a Monument be erected in the Collegiate Church of St. Peter, Westminster, to the memory of the late Right Honourable the Marquess of Salisbury, with an Inscription expressive of the high sense entertained by the House of his rare and splendid gifts and of his devoted labours in Parliament and in great Offices of State; and to assure His Majesty that this House will make good the Expenses attending the same.—(*Mr. A. J. Balfour.*)

Resolution to be reported To-morrow.

FINANCE BILL.

[Second Reading.]

Order read for resuming adjourned debate on Amendment to Question [16th May], "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Which Amendment was—

> "To leave out from the word 'That,' to the end of the Question, in order to add the words 'this House, having regard to the heavy burden of taxation proposed by this Bill in a time of peace, deems it necessary to declare its condemnation of the large and continuous increase of the national expenditure in recent years.'"—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Lord ALWYNE COMPTON (Bedfordshire, Biggleswade) wished to congratulate the Chancellor of the Exchequer on having brought in a Budget based on the sound principles that direct and indirect taxation should go hand in hand. Personally he had only one criticism to make. He and his constituents objected to the tax on tea, believing there were other and better means of obtaining money for the Exchequer. He would never forget the speech made by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Bristol in which he spoke of the desirability of broadening the incidence of taxation. All he would say on that subject was that it was because the Government were bound by the cast-iron rules of an old heresy that they were not permitted to broaden the basis of taxation, if there was the slightest possibility of benefiting any producer or manufacturer in this country in the process. But the part of the Motion that was of real importance was that in which it asked the House —

> "To declare its condemnation of the large and continuous increase of the national expenditure in recent years."

If there was any meaning at all in those words it was that the expenditure of the last few years was unnecessary and unremunerative. Had that been proved in the debate? Different views were held as to the justice of the South African War, but, having visited that country, he doubted whether anyone with knowledge of the subject would deny that there were enormous potentialities in South Africa, and that when the country was developed it would prove to be a most remunerative investment for the money that had been spent. All through the debate there had been elaborate and detailed criticism of past expenditure, but except in the speeches of the hon. Members for Whitby and Oldham, there had been no suggestion whatever with regard to the future. Those two hon. Members who had left the Unionist Party in spirit but not in the flesh, had suggested that in consequence of the destruction of the Russian Navy by the Japanese a reduction should be made in the British Fleet. Personally, he would strongly protest against any reduction in the Army or in the Navy. As far as the Army was concerned, he sometimes had an uncomfortable feeling with regard to the amount of money that was being spent and the value obtained, but it should be remembered that a voluntary Army was an expensive luxury, and as long as it was the desire of the people of this country to have a voluntary Army they would have to pay for it. As to the Navy, it was true that events in the East had altered the balance of power, but at the same time the advance made by Germany in the construction of her navy might well give the Government pause before they consented to any reduction in the British

Fleet. He challenged the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition and his followers to state boldly whether, when the time came for them to cross the floor of the House, they would reduce the British Army and Navy, and, if so, the extent to which they would carry that policy.

Much had been heard on the question of economy, and many Members had expressed a desire to retrench and cut down expenditure. Surely hon. Members must be aware how illogical it was to express such views, and then on almost every other occasion to urge further expenditure. The absurdity of the position reached its height when, in a recent discussion on harbours of refuge, Member after Member who represented constituencies bordering on the sea asked for a harbour to be built in his district. Included in the number was the hon. Member for Argyllshire, although anybody with any knowledge on the subject knew that the West Coast of Scotland was the portion of the British Isles which least required harbours of refuge because of the natural conformation of the coast. Many references had been made in the course of the debate to Imperialism. All were Imperialists now, but different views were held as to the manner in which the policy should be applied. The Unionist Party had refused, and always would refuse, to run the Empire on the cheap. If hon. Members opposite held a different view on that point, he invited them to attempt to convince the electorate that a cheese-paring policy was the right one to apply to the Government of the Empire, and he would be very much surprised if the British people paid any attention to them.

*SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT (Monmouthshire, W.): Though I have not been able lately to take part in the debates of this House, I have felt that upon this question, so far as my powers go, I ought to contribute what I can. I take the earliest opportunity which I have enjoyed of conveying to the Chancellor of the Exchequer my congratulations, in addition to those which he has already received from all quarters, on the manner in which he has discharged his responsible duties and the ability and the frankness with which he has placed before the House the condition of the finances of the country. The right hon. Gentleman is a skilful artist; I should almost call him a financial *cordon bleu*. He is able to serve up disagreeable facts in a manner which is almost agreeable and to give a pleasant flavour to unsavoury viands. I admire the way in which the right hon. Gentleman has dressed up two successive deficits by an increase of £4,500,000 in taxation in times of peace, and made it appear as if it were almost a dainty dish to set before the king. However that may be, he must excuse us if we feel that, after all, the repast is neither appetising nor nourishing. I would like also to offer my congratulations to a younger Member of the House, the Secretary to the Treasury. He is an old friend of mine, but I assure him it is in a public and not in a private capacity that I tender to him this acknowledgment.

Before I proceed to any criticism on the Budget, I would record my entire agreement with many of the sentiments of the Chancellor of the Exchequer upon financial matters. In the first place, I have nothing but applause to render for the sturdy language which he held on the subject of the Sinking Fund. No man's practice always entirely accords to his principles, and I am hopeful that in the future the benefit of the Sinking Fund will not be drawn upon by diverting from it certain funds that ought to have gone to the liquidation of the Debt. Again, I can only approve of his adhesion to the doctrine of maintaining, I do not say pedantically, but substantially, an equality between direct and indirect taxation. That is a matter which, after a generation, has been achieved by the operation of successive Chancellors of the Exchequer. They have destroyed that cruel system which, under the reign of protection, before the days of Sir Robert Peel and the Administration of Mr. Gladstone, imposed certainly two-thirds of the burden of taxation upon the poorer classes, who are the least able to bear it. I recognise completely what was stated the other night by the hon. and learned Member for Waterford—that Ireland being the poorest part of the Kingdom, is the country which most suffers from the aggravation of indirect taxation. I have always said so myself, and I have always endeavoured to act upon it. Therefore, in my opinion, any attempt to alter to the disadvantage of the people the relation between direct and indirect taxation is one which ought to be opposed by all who have regard to the poorer classes of the community, and especially to the Irish people. Therefore I am not, as the Chancellor of the Exchequer will perceive, an adherent to the principle of a universal system of scientific tariffs. I prefer the unscientific but less unjust system of taxation which has a due regard to the interests of the different classes of the community.

Then the right hon. Gentleman informed us — and here again I am able to agree with him entirely—that we have enjoyed a great wave of prosperity for many years. To what has that been due? It is a miracle, surely, under a system which we are told has suffered so long under the curse of free imports. How comes it that this wave of prosperity for many years has unfortunately last year failed the Exchequer? The right hon. Gentleman frankly explained to us that that was not due to any errors in our fiscal system, but to occasional circumstances, which he explained in great detail and with complete accuracy. Then there was another sentiment with which I entirely concur. The right hon. Gentleman stated that there were many people who recommended to him methods of taxation which commended themselves to "people who were more concerned to tax out of existence somebody or something they dislike than to provide revenue for the Exchequer." That is an admirable sentiment, and it is impossible to express more accurately the fundamental principle of taxation—namely, that it should be for revenue, and for revenue only. It is not to be a spiteful system, intended to retaliate on the detested foreigner, who may be our best customer; but it should be for revenue alone. That is a very true doctrine, and I am glad the right hon. Gentleman has so well expressed it. It is the doctrine of purely unscientific tariffs and of the days before the advent of un-Royal Commissions. I only trust that the right hon. Gentleman may impress that doctrine on the hon. and gallant Member for Sheffield, and that he may convert to it possibly even the Prime Minister.

I am afraid that here I must diverge from my agreement with the right hon. Gentleman. We have to consider what is the financial position of the country to-day; and I can honestly and sincerely say, without regarding financial subjects from a Party point of view, that I view the financial situation with great regret and with great apprehension. Never within my recollection has it been—I do not like to use alarmist language—in a more thoroughly unsatisfactory condition than we find it to-day. What is the position? My right hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition the other day said that in former times, after a great and costly war, you had a diminution of taxation. Yes, you had not only relief from war taxes, but retrenchment to repair the damage that had been done. In 1815 the House of Commons, in a wave of enthusiasm, swept away a 2s. income-tax in an afternoon. I do not ask the House now to proceed to such heroic measures as that; but the Crimean War was followed by the great reforms of Mr. Gladstone in 1860, in which I do not know how many tariffs, scientific or otherwise, were swept from the Statute-book, and the era of free trade, which brought that prosperity to which the Chancellor of the Exchequer alluded, may be said to have been completed. But what is our position to-day? We have had a war entailing four times over the cost of the Crimean War. What is our position with reference to that? I prophesied last year, on the Budget of the late Chancellor of the Exchequer, that the relief then given was the last the country would receive, I am sorry to say that the event has proved worse than my prediction, because it has been followed not by relief but by an aggravation of taxation. The right hon. Gentleman was good enough to compliment the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bristol and myself upon the taxes by which we should be remembered. He said they would keep our memory green. I am happy to reciprocate his solicitude for our good fame and to promise for the memory of the present Chancellor of the Exchequer that it will be kept green by the fact that he is the first Chancellor of the Exchequer who has followed up peace by two deficits and an aggravation of taxation. That is a record which is not to be found in the whole history of British finance.

I have sometimes thought that our financial system is rather absurd in this—that we proceed to determine what we will spend before we examine what we have got or are likely to get to meet our expenditure. I have sometimes thought that, if the financial year ended with the calendar year, you might have the financial statement laid before the House at the same time as the Estimates. In these circumstances you would consider both together, as we are, perhaps rather irregularly, now considering both together, and determining whether or not we can afford to spend all the Government asks for—whether the country is in a position to accept that taxation, which is the necessary consequence of the sums you are voting. But as it is we do not know when we are voting them whether they mean addition to taxation or the extent of that addition. There have been instances when the Budget has been brought in before or at the time of voting Estimates. and certainly to go blindly into unlimited expenditure without considering the effect in the sacrifices this may entail upon the people is not a business like method of dealing with the finances of a great country. I will not trouble the House with elaborate figures; they have been repeated, they ought to be and I hope will be repeated throughout the country, for the people do not sufficiently consider these matters. In my recollection we used to consider the expenditure of a few hundred thousand pounds as a serious matter deserving examination, but now we toss about millions as if they were half-crowns. That in great part is the reason for our present position, the neglect of the House of Commons, which ought to be the guardian of the finances of the country and the taxation of the people. I will just take one figure. In 1895–96 the money levied by taxation—(and I take that rather than the gross figures because I think it is the fairest way in dealing with taxation, and I do not include non-tax revenue), as I find them in the Return of the Member for Wolverhampton—amounted to £85,000,000 and in 1904 the amount estimated is £121,000,000, a difference of £36,000,000 as the increment of taxation. We ought to ask ourselves, and the country ought to ask, What is the justification for this increase in the second year of peace? That is the whole point of this discussion. We know that expenditure does and must normally increase with the growth of population and of wealth, but the question is whether it is increasing in a moderate and justifiable degree or not. We all know that under what we believe to be a sound fiscal system each year there should be an increase of population and trade with an increase of revenue which we are entitled to use for the purpose of meeting the growing demands of the country, and even affording some relief of taxation. But, as the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Bristol has pointed out, you began with very modest increments of £500,000, £1,000,000, £2,000,000; but our expenditure has gone on like a falling stone with accelerated velocity, and you come now to £4,500,000 a year on the average of these latter years I have spoken of, and the worst of all is that each year in succession grows worse, and if you take the last six years you will find it is at the rate of £5,000,000. That is the situation which, in my opinion, is so grave and alarming. The right hon. Gentleman thought the increase was only proportionate to the increase in the revenue of the country, and he went back for forty years; but I go back five years and say that it is perfectly certain that your increment of expenditure is in far greater ratio than the growth of your wealth. Your wealth is not increasing in the ratio of the increase of your expenditure, and while, when the increase in revenue was between half a million and two millions, there was relief of taxation, here it is accompanied by increase in taxation, and that marks the whole difference in the position.

Everybody knows that the great increase of cost has been in the naval and military expenditure of the country. The noble Lord who has just sat down pledges himself, and his friends I suppose, that never under any circumstances will he agree to cheap Imperialism; but I should like to know what is the upper limit of Imperialism if the councils of the noble Lord are to be followed in this matter. You have added £10,000,000 to Army expenditure, and I say nothing upon that, for I am not an expert in military affairs. But I know that those who are say that it has been muddled through, and that is not a satisfactory increase of expenditure, and with such an expenditure there is no advance in efficiency. You have had various schemes of Army reform, and never yet have I known a scheme of Army reform that was not accompanied by increased expenditure. Then, again, it is admitted this country must have a strong Navy; but there are people who are so nervous on the subject that they are not satisfied unless there is an extraordinary increase in naval expenditure every year, and the more you increase the more it is necessary to increase further. Now I should like to quiet the nerves of those gentlemen who are alarmed about the condition of the British Navy. There is a very instructive answer given to the hon. Member for Chester on this subject. These are the figures in relation to the great navies of Europe. In 1900 Great Britain spent on her Navy £32,000,000, and in the year ending 1904 £41,000,000 is to be spent. France in 1900 spent £12,500,000, and is to spend exactly the same in 1904. Russia in 1900 spent £11,000,000, and in 1904 is to spend £12,000,000 or £1,000,000 more. Germany in 1900 spent £7,500,000 and in 1904 £11,000,000 or £3,500,000 more. You have, therefore, with these three great European Powers last mentioned an increase of £4,500,000 on naval expenditure in four years, while in the same period the increase by Great Britain was double that amount, or £9,000,000. That should quiet alarm with reference to the British Navy. The whole naval expenditure of Great Britain this year is £41,500,000; but add the expenditure of the three other great Powers and the amount is £35,500,000; so that England is spending £6,000,000 this year more than the three other Powers combined. It may be added, the circumstance is perfectly admitted, that Great Britain can build ships more quickly when required and 20 or 30 per cent. cheaper than any other nation. That is all I desire to say about the Navy.

Now what is the situationof the country with reference to taxation imposed for the war? We thought we were very fairly taxed even before the war, it was consistent with that great wave of prosperity of which the Chancellor of the Exchequer spoke; but we have had an interesting Paper put before us, also in answer to a Question, which represents the taxes remaining after the war. The war taxes which still remain amount to £16,000,000 of indirect and £10,000,000 of direct taxation, so that the principle of equality between the two has not come about. I will not deal with the coal tax. I go to indirect taxation on articles of common comsuption. You are raising £6,000,000 of war taxes from sugar, £4,000,000 from tea, £2,000,000 from tobacco, and £2,700,000 from spirits and beer, a total of £14,700,000 taxation, largely paid by the poorest classes in the country. That cannot be denied, and it is a very serious matter. The income-tax remains at £10,000,000, and that brings the war taxation remaining to £24,700,000. In one of his speeches dealing with the tea duty the Chancellor of the Exchequer either said himself or quoted somebody else to the effect that people were apt to over-saturate themselves with tea. I do not know whether it will be said any people are over-saturated with income, but in any case £10,000,000 for income-tax is a serious thing. There is a significant and instructive passage in Carlyle's "French Revolution," in which, speaking of the consequences of the extravagance which had accumulated to deficits which it was found impossible to meet and led to that revolt of an exhausted people suffering from the crushing burden of taxes, he writes—"they always ultimately fall on the dumb ranks of those who, with spade and empty wallet, daily come into contact with the realities." That is the evil of taxes of this description; they always fall ultimately upon the dumb ranks of those who, with spade and empty wallet, daily come into contact with the realities. That is the case especially with the poorer communities of this country and the greatest of the poor communities is Ireland. These are considerations which, I believe, far more than scientific tariffs, that suit the intent of capitalists, ought to occupy the consideration of the House of Commons.

If I am not wearying the House, I should like to say something upon what is a drier, but not less important topic, and that is the condition of the Debt charge. There is nothing so important to the commerce of this country as the manner in which you deal with the National Debt. Those who know anything of the situation of England as the great money market of the world know that its credit depends on the treatment of the National Debt, and all trade depends upon credit. You have not abstracted £159,000,000 of money borrowed and spent on unproductive expenditure which would have gone to the maintenance of the industry of this country without inflicting upon it very serious mischief. Let us see how the Debt stands. The aggregate gross liabilities of this country (deducting assets) were this year £763,000,000, that is to say, they are £155,000,000 more than they were in 1899, the year before the war. In order to find a similar figure for the Debt you have to go back a whole generation to the year 1873. In spite of all the efforts you have continuously made to reduce the Debt, you have gone back thirty years. In these thirty years there had been most careful attention to reducing the burden of debt in this country. That has been swept away by the war. The character of the Debt also has altered for the worse. It has always been the object of every financier, the right hon. Member for West Bristol as well as myself, to endeavour to reduce as far as possible the Unfunded Debt, and the right hon. Gentleman did succeed in bringing it down to £8,000,000. What does the House suppose the Unfunded Debt is to-day?—£71,000,000. We know if you have an emergency, the renewal of the Unfunded Debt becomes a very serious matter, with reference to the interest you have to pay upon it and the disturbance which is usual to the money market. Now there has been a great deal said of the evil system of what is called "the extraordinary debt"—capital outside the regular Debt. It used to be a million or two, now it is £31,000,000. This extraordinary debt is like the extraordinary budgets of foreign countries, which are one of the greatest curses of finance. After you have passed the Statute authorising the borrowing for these special funds you hear no more of it, and it is done really without the cognisance of the House of Commons or of the country. It has been said that each of these borrowings has a little sinking fund of its own; but that is no answer, because that sinking fund is paid by the taxpayer in the Vote for the money for that sinking fund, so that anything more injurious to sound finance than this large external extraordinary debt cannot be conceived. So much for the capital of the Debt. When you come to what is called the cash account (that is the annuity payable for the Debt, is an annuity and not a capital sum), you find that this year the interest on the Debt is £21,000,000. In 1899 it was £17,000,000, so that there is an increase of £4,000,000. It has swept away the whole advantage of the conversion of the Debt, which amounted to about £3,000,000, and you have to go back to the year 1884 to find a year in which you paid in interest on the Debt the same sum as you are paying this year. You have swept away, consequently, the whole of the economy and the whole of the advantages which you obtained by the prudent and sound finance which has hitherto existed. How long will it be, with regard to the Debt, before you get back to the *status quo ante bellum?* I doubt very much whether there is any man listening to me to-day who will see that time. These are most serious considerations. They are not very much "understanded of the people," but they have a very serious bearing on the credit of the country, on the trade of the country, and on the taxation of the people. They justify my statement that the financial condition of this country is in a worse position than it has been for many long years. The position is this: the taxation of the country has increased and is increasing, and its expenditure is increasing, I venture to affirm, beyond what you are entitled to attribute to the increase in the wealth of the country. I admit that the wealth of the country is increasing, but not in the ratio of the expenditure of the last five years.

There was one sentence in the speech of the Chancellor of the

Exchequer in which I cordially concur. I know what Chancellors of the Exchequer have to suffer in the House of Commons and from people outside the House of Commons too. An Austrian Prime Minister once said, "Wars are not made by Governments, they are made by newspapers." Expenditure is made by newspapers, and I think also by a great many people in the House of Commons. But the Chancellor of the Exchequer said that "if there is to be economy there must be a change in this House." I agree. Nothing could be more desirable than that there should be a change in this House. I was glad to see it announced, not upon official authority, but upon great authority, that there was to be a change in this House within "a reasonable period." When that reasonable period comes there will be a great competition among the issues which are to be put before the country. I venture to hope that one of the most prominent of these issues will be the expenditure of the Government. In my opinion the country will be, and ought to be, more interested in diminishing expenditure than in increasing scientific taxation. What the nation wants is not more taxes, but less taxes, and fewer of them. Therefore I hope the issue will be determined in that sense. It has been by a long series of diminutions of taxation, and by moderate and sober increases of expenditure, that we have seen this country in the state of prosperity which it has unquestionably enjoyed for the last half century. It is that which has built up that great financial resources which we were all glad and proud to see, and which even under the stress of this costly war, sustained the arms and the strength of this country. The Chancellor of the Exchequer seeks to console us by saying that the country can well afford it. I do not believe it can afford it. We have overdrawn upon and exhausted these resources. You have increased your Debt; you have brought your taxation up to a point when it is oppressive to the people; you cannot borrow another £159,000,000 on the same terms that you have borrowed the last £159,000,000. You cannot go on increasing the income-tax above 1s. as you were able to increase it above 8d.; you cannot go on augmenting indirect taxation without causing great discontent in the country. In another emergency you will lack the resources which stood by you before you began the last extravagant war. During the former period it was very different. Under successive Chancellors of the Exchequer belonging to different Parties you diminished debt and reduced taxation, but in later years you have piled up debt and increased the taxes. Now, if I may use the phrase, you are beginning to overtax the resources of the country. Your rate of expenditure is increasing at a ratio greater than the increase of your resources, and in my opinion—I may have no other opportunity of offering it in this House—the House of Commons and the country should cry "Halt!" in this reckless expenditure.

It has been well said that expenditure depends upon policy. If your policy is to be judged by your expenditure your policy must be condemned. What is expensive, what is extravagant, what leads to great expenditure, is the spirit of inflation, of annexation, of raids in every quarter of the world, of retaliation, tall talk, appeals to international jealousy, the false doctrine that every good which comes to others is an injury and an evil to ourselves. Those are arts which delude ignorant people. They are an expensive luxury; they are things by which the people may be deluded, but which in the end they will have to pay dearly for. The fruits of such a policy may be read, I think, in the contents of this Bill. They are ruinous expenditure, aggravated debt, and intolerable taxation.

MR. CHAPLIN (Lincolnshire, Sleaford) said that the right hon. Gentleman began his speech by telling the House that he had been unable recently to take part in their debates. He was sure they all rejoiced at the right hon. Gentleman's intervention, and, if he might say so without presumption, he would offer his congratulations to the right hon. Gentleman on what he would call the "good old form" he had displayed, which reminded the House of so many of those speeches to which hon. Members had listened with pleasure and admiration on both sides of the House.

They had learned with regret from public statements that the time had come when the right hon. Gentleman had decided that he would not seek re-election in a future Parliament in this House. The right hon. Gentleman and himself came into the House together. In their time across the floor and sometimes across the Table of the House they had had many bouts, but he was sure the right hon. Gentleman would believe him when he told him that there was no one in the House who would regret his absence more thoroughly, or deplore it more than he would himself, because the right hon. Gentleman would be another old link gone in connection with the past, and he would be another great ornament of the old school of debate removed from the House.

The right hon. Gentleman was of opinion that the financial position of the country at the present moment was very bad, and he seemed to argue that hon. Members on the Ministerial Benches did not appear to consider the position sufficiently seriously. He had heard between thirty and thirty-five Budgets discussed, but he could not recall an occasion when a formal Resolution was moved by the Leader of the Opposition in condemnation of the Budget of the day, on which the state of the Benches could be taken as an index of the interest displayed in the debate than on the present occasion. The Leader of the Opposition had to speak to Benches which were partly empty, and during the remainder of the debate the House was practically a desert, and it was even necessary to move a count in order to procure the necessary degree of attendance. The right hon. Gentleman said that the present condition of the finance of the country was unsatisfactory, and that he viewed with the greatest apprehension the large increase in expenditure. He himself admitted there was a large increase; he deplored the necessity for it, and no one would wish to see it reduced more than he would. But there was another side to the question, and that was that if expenditure had increased, so also had the responsibilities and duties of Empire increased. It might be true that the expenditure of the country was increasing, and continuing to increase; but so also was the increment of the national wealth. It was impossible to avoid some, at all events, of the increased items of national expenditure; and the answer to the speech of the right hon. Gentleman, and the reason why the House of Commons did not take the Resolution as seriously as was intended was that right hon. Gentlemen and hon. Gentlemen opposite, while complaining of increased expenditure, did not give the shadow of an indication as to how that expenditure could be reduced, and if they were serious and intended to carry the country with them they should be prepared to show how the national expenditure could be reduced. He was not at all surprised that right hon. Gentlemen opposite had not attempted to do that. It was very easy for them to say that they condemned large expenditure, and very easy to put it in the form of a Resolution; but it was exceedingly difficult to put any such Resolution into practice. By all means let expenditure be cut down, but right hon. Gentlemen should be sure that they were right before they began. If they were not, they would, as had happened hundreds of times before, have to replace the expenditure, oftentimes in a great hurry, sometime even in times of panic and at a cost greater than before.

The right hon. Gentleman had a cut and dried plan of his own. He said that the country required not only a change of policy but a change of Government. That being so, he would no doubt be gratified to learn that the Leader of the Opposition and, even a more important personage, the chief Whip of the Liberal Party, had made up their minds that the present Government was doomed. On Saturday the chief Whip was reported to have said that although they would be none the worse for another year or so in order to make sure of the 150 seats they required, yet he predicted with confidence that the Liberal Party would achieve a record victory, such as had not been seen for 100 years. He himself had his doubts. Personally, he hoped the Liberals would win; but whether they would make a record was another question. When they did achieve their desire, they would be met with a Nemesis in the long list of promises and pledges all unredeemed, on which they would have floated themselves into power, and for which they would have to pay immediately afterwards. On the very threshold of office they would have to meet the questions of Home Rule and the financial relations between Great Britain and Ireland, and he was sure the hon. Member for Waterford would keep the nose of the Leader of the Opposition very closely to the grindstone regarding them. He doubted whether either of those policies would have the effect of facilitating very greatly the reduction of expenditure which they desired to make. Another thing which would have to be dealt with was the Resolution which had been moved and which hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite would do their best to carry. A Resolution of this kind passed by the leaders of the Opposition pledged them, it must be remembered, to a corresponding reduction of these burdens the moment they had the opportunity to attempt it.

Where was this reduction to be made? A part of the large increase had been due to education. In his view, far too large a charge had been placed on the rates for education now. Was it on education that the Party opposite were going to make a reduction. The right hon. Member for the Forest of Dean had spoken of "doles" That was an ominous expression which he did not like. He remembered that one of the surpluses of earlier years was devoted to the relief of agricultural land; that, he believed, was called a dole, and he felt some alarm under the circumstances as to what the attitude of hon. Gentlemen opposite would be when the Act came to be renewed. It would have to be renewed in 1906, at which date, according to the Chief Liberal Whip, the Party opposite would be in power. Were they going to continue the Act? If so, one of the sources from which they might get something in reduction of expenditure would be gone for ever. If they were not going to continue it, then one of the first effects of their succeeding to office would be the doubling of the rates upon land. That might be a right and proper policy, but it would not help very materially with the record majority of which the House had heard; the immense number of seats the Liberal Party hoped to gain. If there was one thing the rural voter had a more holy horror of than of anything else it was anything in the nature of the increase of rates. He offered these few remarks in order that hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite might not come to any hurried decision when the good time came. After all, there were only two items to fall back upon, the Navy and the Army, called by the Leader of the Opposition "the bottomless gulf of unprofitable expenditure into which this money has been flung." Our Navy, and the prepared state it was in, had probably in his (Mr. Chaplin's) opinion saved this country a great war with a great European Power which would have cost hundreds of millions at the time of the Fashoda incident. They might even try their policy of reduction on either or both the Navy and Army, and he was not at all sure that the Party which, when they were last in office, depleted our stores and left this country without the necessary amount of requisite taxation, would not be capable of reducing the Navy to what in his opinion might be a perilous extent.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: I beg the right Gentleman's pardon, the hon. Member says we left the country without the requisite amount of taxation. Why, Sir, we left three years of great surpluses.

Mr. CHAPLIN apologised for having used the wrong word—he was alluding to the cordite incident and should have used the word "ammunition." He recommended the Party opposite, before dealing in too stringent a manner with the Navy, to remember the fate which befel a former Chancellor of the Exchequer who brought his political career to an untimely close by suggesting that very considerable reductions must be made, and suggesting our coaling stations for the purpose of the experiment. He was not one of those who thought there was any reason for hysterics because of the Estimates presented to-day. Our Budget, after a prolonged and costly war, was very little larger than that of our neighbour, France, after a long period of profound peace. Even if they desired to see reductions made as far as possible, there was no reason to lose their heads.

A few days previously he had been challenged to say whether or not he was not greatly disappointed with the present Budget. He could relieve all apprehension on that score. He was not in the least disappointed. It had been suggested that he would be disappointed, because instead of the increase of the tea duty there had not been a re-imposition of the shilling duty on corn. But he was fully aware that that was impossible, because, owing to the passion and prejudice displayed on the other side, and to a certain amount of weakness exhibited on the Government side, an honourable pledge had been given that no duty of that kind should be imposed during the present Parliament. The result had been a chorus of lamentations, because of the increase of the duty on tea The right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition started the complaint, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Wolverhampton pointed out that the price of tea had already been raised to the full extent of the increase of duty, and that the burden fell with excessive severity on the poorest of the poor; the hon. Member for West Islington declared that tea had become as important as bread to the poor; the hon. and learned Member for Waterford dilated upon the cruel infliction involved upon the poorest of the Irish people; and the same complaint of hardship was made by the hon. Members for Dumfries, Crewe, Poplar, South Tyrone, Donegal, and Woolwich. He agreed that the duty on tea would undoubtedly be felt by the poorest of the poor; but why? Because of the clamour made by the right hon. Gentleman opposite and his followers against the shilling duty on corn. He himself last session raised the question of the relative merits of the shilling duty on corn and a 2d. increase in the duty on tea, and argued strongly against the latter, but in the division on that occasion, those who now complained so bitterly of the tea duty, deserted him to a man. He submitted, therefore, that it did not lie with hon. Members opposite to complain of the tea duty, seeing that they deserted him last year, when he was doing his utmost to procure the very thing they now professed to desire. The Government, however, were now helpless, unless they could be released from the pledge which he thought they had somewhat foolishly given. But if right hon. and hon. Gentleman opposite were really sincere in their professions, there was a chance for them yet. If the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Wolverhampton and his friends would acknowledge that, judging by the light of subsequent experience, their views as to the mischievous nature of the shilling duty on corn were mistaken, and would constitute the Member for Sleaford their ambassador to support their changed views before the Chancellor of the Exchequer, he believed there was yet a possibility of the poorest of the poor being relieved of a tax which they would undoubtedly feel by the substitution of a tax which they would not feel in the slightest degree. If, however, the Party opposite declined to take that course—as he fancied they would, so obstinate was human nature—it would give Members of the Unionist Party the opportunity of explaining to their constituents, that, however loud hon. Members opposite might be in their professions of anxiety for the interests of the poorer classes, when it came to the test those professions were absolutely worthless.

*SIR HENRY FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.): I need scarcely say that I shall not accept the invitation of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Sleaford to make a public recantation of opinions I have already expressed, but I sympathise with his anxiety that the time should be hastened when he might proclaim in countless cottage homes the desirability of a tax upon corn.

MR. CHAPLIN: I do it now.

*SIR HENRY FOWLER: Then I have no doubt we shall see the result of the seed he is sowing when the harvest is reaped. The speech of the right hon. Gentleman has been characterised, as are all his utterances, by uniform good feeling towards his opponents, and a fair and courageous statement of his own views; but it has not touched the Resolution. In that respect he has but followed the example of all other supporters of the Government who have spoken. This debate has been distinguished by a masterly speech from my right hon. friend, whose memory, according to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, will always be kept green in the recollection of the people of this country by the admirable manner in which he discharged the duties of Finance Minister when he held that responsible post; never was my right hon. friend heard with greater pleasure on either side of the House, and never, even in his most powerful days, did he make a more able speech in defence of those principles, those canons of fiscal policy, which he has advocated so uniformly through a long series of years.

Last night we had from the Financial Secretary to the Treasury a very interesting speech, which deserved the eulogium passed upon it by my right hon. friend the Member for West Monmouth; but beyond a repetition of the oft exploded delusion as to the state in which the late Government left the defences of the country in 1895, he merely read Members of the House of Commons a lecture—I do not say an unnecessary one—for uniformly desiring to increase the expenditure of the country. But there is nothing new in that experience. Every Secretary to the Treasury and every Chancellor of the Exchequer knows that the greatest enemies to reduction of expenditure are Members of the House of Commons. I remember the late Mr. Childers once told me that during the time he was in office he kept a record of the proposals made in this House for reducing and those for increasing expenditure, and he found that, in round figures, about twenty proposals were made for reducing expenditure, while over 500 were made for increasing it. I shall have something to say presently about the exact functions of Committee of Supply, but I do not think that the general inclination of Members who have no special responsibility for the taxation or the expenditure of the country, and who are naturally inclined to take a local point of view, is a satisfactory answer to urge in a great crisis in the financial position of the nation. The hon. Member for Fulham, however, used a singular expression towards the close of his speech. He said that it was necessary that the Prime Minister and the Chancellor of the Exchequer should develop a high moral and political courage "in order to refuse demands made upon them by their colleagues and the House for expenditure." A further justification of the attitude taken up by the Secretary to the Treasury with regard to the House advocating expenditure one day and economy the next, was made, amongst others, by the hon. Member for Newcastle, who declared his sympathy with the protectionist views of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Sleaford, and contended that what we were suffering from was a financial policy which had too narrow a basis. I was, however, surprised, on examining the Division List, to find that on Friday last that hon. Member voted in favour of a large dole being given from the general Exchequer for the benefit of one particular trade.

MR. CHAPLIN: I opposed the Bill to which the right hon. Gentleman refers.

*SIR HENRY FOWLER: I am not charging the right hon. Gentleman with that, but the hon. Member for Newcastle. Personally I regret that that measure did pass a Second Reading. I wish, however, to ask the House to deal with the Motion before us. It is a Motion which calls attention to the heavy burden of taxation proposed by this Bill in a time of peace, and asks the House to declare its condemnation of the large and continuous increase of the national expenditure in recent years. Let us get a clear idea in our own minds of that heavy burden before we go to the methods to be taken in order to reduce it. We have had many figures quoted in this debate, and I have no doubt we shall have many more before the discussion closes, and therefore I am very reluctant to add even the smallest contribution to those figures. I think that the Chancellor of the Exchequer is following the bad example of his predecessor in the mode in which he presented our financial position to the House in his Budget speech. We have a mystified state of the finances in which there is exaggeration on the one side and concealment on the other. The figures given to us in the official statement represent the country as having an increased burden of taxation up to an amount which it has not had, and an expenditure and a taxation much less than that which the correct figures disclose. I will tell the House where I think the first error arises. My right hon. friend alluded to this when he referred to my Return and dealt with the non-tax revenue, but there is also an additional revenue which is non-tax, but which also involves a burden upon the people. Take the Post Office. There you have on the one side an enormously increasing expenditure which is greater this year than it has ever been before, and on the other side you have the Post Office revenue. Let us take a period of three years. In 1882 the Post Office cost £5,500,000; in 1892, £9,250,000; in 1902 it cost £15,250,000, and it is costing more now. But that is no burden upon the people. Of course the net revenue from the Post Office increases only by a small amount, and in the last ten years it has not increased more than a quarter of a million. There is a large sum spent every year upon the development of facilities for the public, and this outlay in our accounts appears as taxation in one sense, but it is really outlay by the Government in carrying on a business, but all we have to consider is the net profit. I give the Chancellor of the Exchequer the benefit of that on the one side, but on the other side I come back to an old grievance, viz., the non-accuracy of the statement of the revenue for the past year, and the estimated revenue for the coming year. The Chancellor of the Exchequer in his Budget speech last year said the death duties produced £13,000,000. That was the truth, but not the whole truth, because the revenue from the death duties last year was £17,000,000. The right hon. Gentleman said the Excise produced £31,500,000, but the real revenue from that source was £37,000,000 and therefore we are misled in looking at the result of the death duties to which we are indebted to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Monmouthshire. This mistake arises from the ridiculous plan of having a local taxation account and allocating certain portions of certain taxes to certain purposes. You might as well deduct from the income-tax £10,000,000 a year, hand it over to the Navy, and call it local taxation, and then state the Navy charge at £10,000,000 less. I did appeal to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Croydon last year, and he promised to take this into his consideration this year to see if he could not make a more intelligent and intelligible statement of the position on this subject. This system was introduced like a good many other unfortunate blunders in finance, at a time when there was a good reason politically for it, and a good Party reason. It might be correct to say that if this had not been done great reforms in local government would not have been carried out, and that it was necessary to have a make-believe in order to assure those who undertook certain burdens that they would have a commensurate advantage from them. That was the beginning of the evil. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Sleaford has referred to what he calls the great reform of the Rating Bill and he has threatened that any attempt to interfere with that will sweep the Liberal Party out of existence. But when he introduced his relief of agricultural rates instead of saying boldly, "I propose to put on the Votes so much money to be paid to the agricultural interest in relief of rates," he deducted the sum from the death duties, carried it to the local taxation account, and therefore it has been concealed in that way.

These allocations of certain proportions of general taxation convey a seriously inaccurate statement of what is really raised by Custom, Excise, and Estate Duties. I will now give to the House what I conceive to be the true amount of receipts on the one hand and the true amount of payments on the other. I am going to take the ten years from 1893 as what I will call my datum line. In that year our expenditure met by taxation was in round figures £86,000,000. In this I ask the House to follow me carefully. How was it spent? The Debt cost £25,000,000; the Army and Navy £33,250,000; the whole of the Civil Service £25,000,000; and the collection of taxes £2,750,000. That is roughly how the £86,000,000 was spent. That is an expenditure which we on this side of the House have no right to complain of, and which had the approval of both Liberal and Conservative Administrations. We start from that datum line in 1893–4 with an expenditure of £86,000,000 chargeable upon the taxation of this country. In 1902–3, which is the last year for which we have the Return, the accounts of which have been analysed by the Treasury, we find that the net expenditure has gone up to £127,250,000. This was made up as follows:—Debt £28,750,000; the Army and Navy £60,000,000; Civil Service, including education, £35.750,000, and the collection of taxes £2.750,000; making a total of £127,250,000. I have tried to make the same apportionment of the right hon. Gentleman's estimate for next year. He may not agree exactly with my figures but I take it that the expenditure from taxation for which he has estimated next year is £137,000,000, and therefore there is an increase of the difference between £86,000,000 and £137,000,000 which is practically an increase of £51,000.000 between the year 1893 and the present time. I will tell the right hon. Gentleman how I distinguish that expenditure. I place the Debt at £27,000,000, the Army and Navy at £66,250,000, the Civil Service £40,500,000, and collection £3,000,000, which amounts to £137,000,000. That is how I make up this increase of £51,000,000, which includes £33,000,000 of an increase for the Army and Navy and £15,000,000 for the Civil Service. There has been a large increase in the Civil Service, and it is not fully explained by the statement of the increase upon education. I think there is a great deal of extravagance in the Civil Service as well as in other items of expenditure. If my figures are correct we have put upon the people of this country, and are putting on them by this present Budget, an increase of taxation which represents virtually £51,000,000. This increase is accounted for as follows: — Debt £2,000,000; Army and Navy £33,750,000; Civil Service £15,250,000. But is this increase of Imperial taxation all? When we are talking about the burdens of the people in this country we must remember local taxation. I think I am well within the mark if I put the local taxation at £50,000,000 for England and Wales. I am taking the actual rates for poor relief, police, highways, and education, excluding gas, water, and similar rates, and I am leaving out Ireland and Scotland. I do not think you can put the local and Imperial taxation of the United Kingdom at a penny less than £200,000,000.

The first question which the House and the country has to ask is, Can we afford to tax the people in a time of peace to the extent of £200,000,000 for the purpose of Government? The population of the United Kingdom is 41,000,000, and a taxation of £200,000,000 means an average taxation of £5 a head, man, woman, and child. Well, that is a very large figure, but I distrust averages. You cannot average burdens, at least if you want to average them fairly, without averaging the breadth and strength of the backs which have to bear them. I have been trying to bring home to my own mind and to the minds of others an idea of what the present taxation means and by whom it is borne. My right hon. friend has said that a large and overwhelming portion of the increased taxation is borne by the class who are least able to bear it. Let us take as a test the houses in Great Britain where house duty is levied. I cannot extend this calculation to Ireland because they have no house duty there. In round figures there are 8,000.000 houses in Great Britain. Of these 5,750,000 are under £20 rent, and of the 5,750,000 there are 3,250,000 under £10 rent. If hon. Members will consider these figures they will see where the people live. Of the 8,000,000 houses you may say that four-sixths are under £20 rent. If you take for each house an average of five persons you will see that there must be at least between 25,000,000 and 26,000,000 people who are living in these small houses, and these are the people with respect to whom we have to determine how taxation has to be borne. You have to ask how the taxation affects them, especially when imposed on their daily food and upon everything essential to their comfort. I have been asked at what I estimate the income of the country. It is stated in a recent work that you can put the income of the people of this country at £2,000,000,000. I cannot accept that figure. I do not believe it is £2,000,000,000. I know that the Inland Revenue say that the total amount of income under all the schedules that comes under their notice is £867,000,000. The only other addition is the aggregate of weekly wages, and it is a very difficult calculation as to the total of that. There are different tests. The Board of Trade in the fiscal memoranda attempted—I am speaking from recollection—to solve that, and I think they put the wage income of this country at about £700,000,000 to £720,000,000. That would give us something like an income from the whole of about £1,600,000,000. If that be the income of the country what an enormous sum £200,000,000 is to raise and spend in taxation, in time of peace. We must stick to that point. There is no use mixing up this with time of war. The nation, if it chooses to go to war, must be prepared to make great sacrifices, but this is a peace expenditure and a peace Budget. That is the reason why this Amendment is now submitted to the House. The Government are asking us to retain in time of peace upwards of £25,000,000 of war taxes. What did the Member for West Bristol say after he had retired from office. I am quoting from his speech made at the end of 1902 after he had ceased to be Chancellor of the Exchequer—

> "I venture to say that the present national indifference to the growth of our expenditure is one of the most dangerous symptoms of the present time. Now, what are the circumstances? Here we are at the close of a great and most costly war, which has cost this country millions, tens of millions, hundreds of millions, not merely in increased taxation, but in increased debt. One would suppose in private life that a man who had outrun the constable in that sort of way would first turn his thoughts to retrenchment. Does anybody nowadays think of retrenchment at all?
>
> "In the last seven years the ordinary expenditure of the country has increased at the rate of no less than £5,500,000 a year. We cannot go on in that way. We must stop that rate of increase. If you do not, what will happen? I will tell you what will happen. A shilling income-tax will be utterly insufficient for the needs of the country even in time of peace; and all the people who complain now of the little, the small taxation that has been imposed upon sugar and corn, will be face to face with heavy taxes, not only, perhaps, on those articles, but on many other great articles of popular consumption.
>
> "You will have changed your fiscal system from a system of light taxation which has prevailed during the last forty years, and under which the industries of the country have been enormously developed, to a system of heavy taxation, which will keep those industries down. And the result will be that whereas, thanks largely to the light taxation of the past, we have accumulated wealth in this country that has enabled us to bear the strain of this three years war with hardly any difficulty at all, you may, in a future day of adversity, perhaps in some time of conflict, not with two Boer Republics, but with a great European Power, find yourselves at the commencement of a great struggle burdened with an enormous weight of taxation in time of peace which will make you absolutely incapable to deal with the cost of the war. That is the warning I venture to give."

There is another reason why I think the people cannot afford this taxation. Where is the margin? Taxation in time of peace must allow a margin for extra taxation in time of war. You have absorbed your margin. It is gone. If the £25,000,000 or £26,000,000 of taxation which was put on for the war had been taken off you would have had that margin in your hand to protect your interests in the future. My right hon. friend alluded to the House of Commons having on one afternoon in 1816 swept away £16,000,000 of income-tax. The Government of that day had to adapt their Budget to the decision of the House. I also believe that the payment of this large sum of money, this £25,250,000, is taken from the reproductive forces of the country. It has been fashionable of late to decry what Mr. Cobden said as very short-sighted and very unsound. Mr. Cobden said, with reference to this question of heavy taxation, that he preferred to leave the money to fructify in the pockets of the people of the country instead of its being paid into the Exchequer. You are destroying the wage-earning power of the country by extracting these sums for the purpose of national expenditure.

The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Sleaford said, Where are you going to reduce? That is the easiest question to put, but it is most difficult to answer. It is a question, I venture to say, not to be answered by those who object to the burdens. I think it is a question to be answered by the Government which proposes enormous increased expenditure. I think it is for them to prove that such an expenditure is necessary. But it has already been truly said that this question of expenditure is a question of policy. The question of expenditure under our system is not to be touched by Votes in Committee of Supply. We had once a Return showing how much money in fifty years had been taken off the Estimates by Votes in this House. It came to £20,000. It is no excuse to blame the House of Commons for the expenditure. I do not think Committee of Supply can effect economies. Committee of Supply is meant to prevent extravagance. There is no Department of the State, which at some time or other does not think of what may be said by the House of Commons with reference to such and such a Vote. It is the fear of criticism which is ten times more valuable than criticism itself. The expenditure of the country must be regulated by the Executive Government of the country and no one else. They are responsible to Parliament, and Parliament is responsible to the country.

There has been a good deal said in the course of this debate about the question of our expenditure and the rate at which it has gone. We have been challenged by everyone who has already spoken on the other side of the House to state whether we are prepared to reduce expenditure on the Navy. Well, I do not know that there is anybody in this House who wishes to leave the country without a strong and powerful Navy. The portion of our expenditure which relates to the Navy is a matter with respect to which I entertain a very strong opinion. The maintenance of our sea power is absolutely necessary to our existence as a nation. Our supremacy in sea power is vital to our existence. My right hon. friend said just now that there must be some top limit to the standard of naval expenditure. Where are you going to stop? That depends on colleagues to some extent and the pressure they put on the Prime Minister and the Chancellor of the Exchequer. I should have thought that Lord Goschen was a very reliable and cautious First Lord of the Admiralty, and one of the last men against whom anybody would bring the charge of being a Little Englander, or the charge of wishing to reduce expenditure unnecessarily. My right hon. friend the biographer of Mr. Gladstone informs us that Lord Goschen differed from Mr. Gladstone so far back as 1874 on the question of defensive expenditure. How did Mr. Goschen act when First Lord of the Admiralty? He was not afraid of saying to foreign Powers what he meant. He said to Russia if you increase, we shall increase; if you reduce, we shall reduce, and he carried out his policy which, as I understand, was what has been called the two-Power standard. It appears to me that Lord Goschen's views in regard to naval expenditure are different from those of the present First Lord of the Admiralty. I have great respect for Lord Selborne, but it seems to me, judging from his public utterances, that if he had his way there would be a boundless increase in the expenditure on the Navy. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Bristol who was inside the Cabinet circle, and who was a responsible Minister, said with respect to the Estimates of last year, 1903-4—

> "He hoped he should not be charged with a desire improperly to curtail the expenditure of the Navy. During the years that he was Chancellor of the Exchequer he had made himself responsible for Navy Estimates, which were raised from £19,000,000 in 1895-96 to over £31,000,000 in 1902-03. He accepted the two-Power standard; he accepted the proposals of the Admiralty in order to keep up to that standard, and he believed that in so doing he was but carrying out his duty to the House and to the country. But since the Estimates of 1902-03—the last for which he was responsible. — the House was asked to sanction an addition of something like £5,500,000.'
>
> "He would take what, after all, was the real test in this matter—new construction. He had made a calculation when he was Chancellor of the Exchequer, taking the best information he could obtain; during the five years ended March, 1901, this country expended £35,000,000 in new construction, whereas France and Russia, the two countries with which we had been generally comparing ourselves, expended something less than £31,000,000 during the same period. There was an excess of £4,000,000. In 1901-02 our estimate for new construction was £9,000,000, and so far as he was able to ascertain the new construction of France and Russia cost something under £7,000,000. He had no figures with regard to France and Russia for 1902-03, but our own new construction in that year was estimated also at about £9,000,000. The estimate for new construction in this year's Estimates was £11,600,000, an increase of £2,500,000. What was the reason for that increase? Had there been an increase in the programme of other countries with which we were obliged to compete such as would justify it? That had never been stated."

The Estimates for 1904-05 showed another large increase of naval expenditure. My right hon. friend the Member for West Monmouthshire has repeated to the House the statement which shows that we have now an expenditure on our Navy which is more than that of France, Germany, and Russia combined. We are not content with the two-Power standard; we have gone beyond the three-Power standard. I ask the most enthusiastic Imperialist in the House, Is there not to be some border line? Who is to draw that line?

If it is alleged that we have reached the limit for the Navy, I am sure that we have long passed the limit for the Army. What can the Executive do to reduce expenditure? That can be done by their policy, and, above all, by their foreign policy. Mr. Disraeli once asked in a discussion of this kind—it was the occasion when he used the expression "bloated armaments"—"What need is there for this enormous, this extravagant, expenditure, when there is nothing in the state of Europe to justify it?" That is a question that might be put to the Government when every outlook was peaceful, when they were receiving the encouragement of an overwhelming section of the people of this country to endeavour to extend a system of friendly negotiation, already so successful towards France, in reference to Russia. A friendly understanding between England and Russia on Asiatic questions is absolutely essential in the interest of our Indian Empire. Let there be co-ordination in the administration of the expenditure of the two great spending Departments. I put it to the Prime Minister as representing the Cabinet that it is for the Cabinet, not the Departments, to decide what the expenditure ought to be, and to defend it in the House of Commons. Very careful control should be exercised over all other Departments. In all of them there is a tendency to increase expenditure. The non-effective charges should receive special attention. We are spending £6,000,000 in pensions and the amount is growing. How will the Government meet the present Motion? When, some twenty years ago, a similar Motion was moved, though not by the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Gladstone himself at once replied and dealt with the whole question of expenditure from beginning to end, and the financial position of this country, and he accepted the Motion; he saw no censure of his Government in so doing.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.): Was it an Amendment to the Budget Bill?

***Sir HENRY FOWLER**: It was not, but it was after the Budget had been brought in. I do not ask the Prime Minister to accept the Motion as it stands, but I ask for an expression of his views, which have not been given, and there has been no expression of sympathy from his side of the House with reference to a reduction of expenditure. I join in praising the speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer on introducing the Budget, but there was an omission from it; the right hon. Gentleman did not say a word expressing approval of reduction of expenditure, but held before the House the dreariest prospect for the future. My right hon. friend has rightly described the state of things as alarming, unhealthy, and dangerous, and he warned Members on the other side of the House who attached so much importance to the defences of the country that there was danger of reaction. Taxation may reach such a point that an impulse of indignation and sense of injustice may sweep away expenditure deemed necessary for the protection of the interests of the country. Increase of taxation, aggravated by unequal pressure on homes least able to bear it, may sooner or later raise a feeling that will cast to the winds all Party ties, all Party loyalty, and declare in an unmistakable manner that there must be, under any circumstances, a reduction of expenditure.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: There have been many interesting features in the debate, which has now gone on for two days, and especially interesting was the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Monmouth, to which every Member will have listened with deep interest and renewed regret at the thought that another House of Commons will not see him in his place. My personal respect is due to the right hon. Gentleman. I acknowledge the kindness of his reference to myself, and

I may say that not the least of my difficulties in the office I hold is that it brings me face to face with such a great figure in Parliamentary life, such a master of finance, so powerful in debate. But, after all, I think the most interesting feature during these discussions has been the condition of the benches opposite. [Laughter and OPPOSITION cries of: "We're all right," and "What of your side ?"] Yes ; there is not more belief in the reality of the discussion on one side than on the other, though a profession of the great need for such a discussion found prominent place in every speech from Members opposite. The right hon. Gentleman who has just spoken said we are in the midst of a grave financial crisis. That is the view of hon. Gentlemen opposite ; but at no period of the debate did they show their sense of the gravity of the situation by an attendance of more than fifty.

MR. J. A. PEASE (Essex, Saffron Walden) : Many more.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN : I accept the correction. There was one moment when the hon. Member for Oldham did violence to his feelings by making a speech against the Government from this side of the House when the attendance was something under 100 ; but for the serious discussion of the great issue raised by the Leader of the Opposition, there were not more than fifty Members on his side of the House. That is the first feature of the debate to which I call attention, and there is another of some interest. This Motion is a repetition in different language of an effort made three years ago from the same Bench when the Amendment was in charge of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Wolverhampton. The Motion then referred to the alarming growth of expenditure and the necessity for economy, but there was a special proviso that the right hon. Gentleman and those for whom he spoke were ready to make adequate provision for naval and military requirements. This was given first place three years ago in the first effort of a "rejuvenated and reunited Opposition." Any one who has listened to the present debate will know that while the Leader of the Opposition and the right hon. Gentleman who has just spoken have declined any indication of where economy was possible, or where reduction should be insisted upon, other Gentlemen from that side have not been so reticent ; they have not hesitated to express their opinion that not one only, but both of the services for the protection of the Empire must be subjected to the ruthless operation of the pruning-knife. I do not think that any attempt was made to show that in any other direction reduction was possible.

What, after all, has been the dangerous increase of expenditure that has taken place ? There is an increase in the charge for the Debt in the last ten years of something like £4,000,000, partly due to a great war and partly to new charges created for interest and sinking fund for naval and military works in course of construction. There has been an increase in the same period of nearly £2,750,000 on civil administration. I am comparing the Estimates of the current year with those of 1894–5, a period for which the Conservative Party has been responsible, and I say there has been an increase. About £800,000 of that is caused by increased expenditure on Colonial and Foreign Office services in protectorates and dependencies in Africa. There have been some reflections on that expenditure. Is the House prepared to condemn it ? We are told, and told rightly, that in regard to many of these matters you cannot have a reduction in expenditure unless you have a reversal of the policy which is being pursued. Do right hon. Gentlemen opposite mean that, if they changed sides to-morrow, they would attempt to reverse the policy which is being pursued ? I should be interested to know what Lancashire would say if they attempted to clear out of these great possessions which we have marked out for the future occupation of the British race in Africa. [AN HON. MEMBER : Chinese.] I am not speaking of South Africa now, but of West Africa and East Africa, especially West Africa. What will Lancashire say to them if they reverse the policy which has been pursued, if they give up the effort to develop these countries to which Lancashire is looking to provide in the future a remedy for the distress which is now existing and to guard them against the danger of being unable to obtain the raw material which is an absolute necessity of their industry? An hon. Gentleman interrupted me with a reference to South Africa. I am not here to apologise for the policy pursued by the Government in regard to South Africa. There are Gentlemen—the Leader of the Opposition among them—who thought that policy wrong from the beginning, who did their best to prevent its coming to a successful conclusion, and who, though they failed to prevent the Government from carrying their policy through, undoubtedly aggravated the difficulties with which they were confronted. But for those of us who approved the policy, who thought it necessary, and who, great as the evils of war are, thought that in that case the evils of surrender would be greater still—we shall never reject a policy which we thought right on its merits merely because it has involved us in a considerable burden of taxation. If, when the country has made up its mind that a certain policy is necessary to the defence of its interests and the defence of its honour, we have come to the point when the country will refuse to find the expenditure necessary to carry it through, the day of our greatness would indeed be past. That is not the view I take of our countrymen. I have never hesitated to justify the expenditure we have incurred, and I am not afraid of the verdict of my countrymen upon it.

The next great increase of expenditure has been upon elementary education. I am well aware that some hon. Members think that the whole of that money is tno spent to the best advantage. I am tno quite certain that any hon. Member thinks that the whole of it is spent to the best advantage, although there is very great difference of opinion in different quarters of the House as to which part of the expenditure might properly be dispensed with. But there is not a Gentleman sitting on that side, or indeed upon this, who believes that the amount we are spending upon national education can be reduced in the future. Then there is an increase of £500,000 in the Revenue Departments, a very small percentage on the greatly increased revenue which they collect. There is a large increase in the amount which we contribute in aid of local taxation. The right hon. Member for Wolverhampton has made an appeal to me, as to both of my predecessors, to recast the form of the national accounts. He said, and I agree, that our accounts are very apt to be misleading to those who do not study them carefully as to the amount of taxation levied on the people. He complained that they did not show the amount levied and paid over in relief of local taxation. There is a great deal to be said for presenting the accounts in the form which the right hon. Gentleman framed, and the Return which bears his name is certainly the best Return for reference, if any one wishes to see the state of affairs, of any laid before the House. But, even if there would be some improvement in recasting them, it must be borne in mind that one object you have in having these accounts from year to year is to enable a comparison to be made, and to see how we compare with other years. If you alter the form of the accounts you destroy the possibility of comparison, and that is, I think, the main objection which has been felt by my predecessors.

Sir HENRY FOWLER: I do not want to recast the accounts at all. What I want is that in the items of expenditure—Army, Navy, and education, and so on—you should put local taxation, and that you should then put on the other side the true amount received from the death duties and Excise.

..Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I think that would still leave the account misleading, but I will consider the right hon. Gentleman's suggestion. I believe it has the support of the right hon. Member for West Monmouthshire, and anything which comes from them in such a matter as this is well worthy of consideration. But, putting that on one side, I return to the increase which we have made in the grants in aid of local taxation, an increase of about £4,250,000 in ten years. You may vary the method by which you provide the money; but one thing I will venture pretty confidently to assert is that, in spite of the opposition which has often come from the benches opposite to the proposal to give this relief, hon. Gentlemen will not venture to withdraw it when they become responsible for the national finances. If they had any intention of withdrawing this relief to local taxation they would not, being anxious that their position should be perfectly clear to the country, allow any doubt to remain as to their intention but would give full notice of what they mean to do.

I have run hastily over all the items of increase in the last ten years except the Army and the Navy. They are, of course, the heaviest burden in the whole of our national account, and it is upon them that the increase has been greatest. General statements are made by hon. Gentlemen opposite to which no one on this side would take any exception. The right hon. Gentleman who preceeded me says he does not wish our Army to vie with the great armies of the Continent. It is not a question whether you wish it or not; the thing is impossible, it is out of the question; it never entered into the mind of man to conceive of this country with an Army capable of vying with the great armies of the Continent as they are organised to-day. What we have to do is to provide ourselves with an Army capable of defending the British Empire. I have regretted very much in the course of this debate to hear from the Leader of the Opposition and several other Gentlemen repeated sneers at the Committee of Imperial Defence which is presided over by the Prime Minister. That is the most effective means that has yet been contrived for perfecting the organisation of our military and naval forces, for co-ordinating the one with the other, for measuring the demands of both against the financial needs of the country, and for developing from the whole a policy which gives us the requisite security at a minimum of expenditure. I say at once no one on this side desires to construct an Army of the character to which the right hon. Gentleman alludes. But when the Leader of the Opposition points to the Army of ten years ago, and inquires what has happened to call for the increase which has since taken place, I am tempted to ask, has he been blind to the changes which have been going on? He speaks of the Central Asian terror, and says we have been accustomed to it for many years past. I think I remember the time when a witty statesman said that the country was afflicted with "Mervousness." But who was right? Those who thought that Merv would pass under the dominion of a great Power or those who bade us turn to large scale maps and see how far Merv was from their frontier? [AN HON. MEMBER: It was Lord Salisbury who said that.] Does the right hon. Gentleman suggest that the march of events in recent years does not give cause for reconsidering the basis of our military policy and has not altered the requirements which our Indian Empire makes for its defence? It is only a year or two ago that we were being denounced by right hon. Gentlemen opposite for the imperfection of our preparation for war and for the insufficiency of the resources that this country had at its command. To-day we are bidden to use the pruning-knife ruthlessly the moment peace has been restored.

The right hon. Gentleman recalled to our minds what the great reductions were which were made on the conclusion of the French war in 1816. But what I wanted to direct attention to was the effect that these sudden and drastic reductions are apt to have on our security in future years. In 1801, when peace was concluded, there was an immediate great reduction in the Navy, and the country nearly paid dearly for that premature and unwise economy when war broke out a couple of years later. Did the economists of 1816 leave us with an Army well prepared, well found, and well equipped when the further great emergency burst upon us in the Crimean War? No. An hon. Member asked whether we have profited by the experience gained in the war now going on and from our own war in South Africa. Yes, we are trying to do so. But as to the lessons of those wars, you cannot make good in haste what you have neglected to provide at your leisure; and if you try to secure a reduction of your burdens at the expense of your security, in times of peace, you have to pay manifold for your neglect when war breaks out, and it may be that you will find that neglect irrevocable. The House also knows that the Government have been giving their most anxious and careful consideration to the question of Army expenditure. It is our desire to reduce the burdens which the military forces now make upon us, and the Prime Minister indicated the change which he thought the new conditions had brought into the problem with which we are confronted. We no longer think it necessary to maintain a great Regular Army for home defence. If that be so, what is it that relieves us of that necessity? It is one thing only; it is the supremacy of our Navy on the seas. The hon. Members for Oldham and Whitby have indicated that the Navy is a proper subject for reduction. Does any hon. Member intend to depart from the standard laid down, I think with the common consent of the House and accepted by both sides, that in future we are to be content with less than the two-Power standard? The right hon. Member for East Wolverhampton did not pretend that we should do anything of the kind, for on a previous occasion he said that "the Navy must at all risks and at all costs be kept up to the point which experts deem to be necessary." Then, again, the Defence Committee has been denounced, and the hon. Member for Oldham said that where an expert was admitted to discuss a question, all sense of reason departed from the deliberations.

Mr. WINSTON CHURCHILL (Oldham): I did not say so, but I adopt it.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: In that case it is one of the suggestive methods by which the hon. Member arrives at his conclusions on many subjects, and it may perhaps account for some of our difficulties. I will assume for the purposes of discussion that the bulk of the House is determined that the two-Power standard shall be maintained in regard to battleships and a greater superiority with reference to cruisers. The contention of the right hon. Gentleman is that we have exceeded and departed from that two-Power standard, that it is now a three-Power standard. I join issue with the right hon. Gentleman. If he acts on the standard laid down he will find that large reductions are not possible in our Navy Estimates. I will take first and second-class battleships. Of battleships Great Britain has built and is building sixty-three, France thirty-five, Russia twenty-eight, after allowing for the loss of the "Petropavlovsk." Germany has twenty-eight battleships, and she is able to concentrate in two of her home ports within a few hours steaming of the Channel. Some hon. Members have spoken as if the results of the war had been to wipe out one of the great navies of the world. I entirely differ from that view. When the present war is over we must, of course, consider the new situation created by it. We must revise our Estimates in the light of the then existing conditions; but, with the exception of one battleship I have struck off, no battleship has been so damaged that with proper docking facilities it cannot be repaired within a short time. We have not, therefore, exceeded the two-Power standard. We are proposing to lay down two further ships in the present year, which will give us a margin of two battleships over the combined fleets of the next two greatest naval Powers. That, however, is not the whole which goes to make up naval strength. It is easy to deceive the country, and not difficult to deceive the House, as to the actual naval preparations if you dwell exclusively on the construction programme and take no account of other items. It has happened before now. The other preparations have been allowed to lag behind, and, indeed, the defence of the right hon. Gentleman opposite when they brought in the first Naval Works Bill, which they are now so ready to condemn, was that the execution of naval works had not kept pace with the increase in the Fleet and it was impossible to overtake arrears out of current taxation. How important dockyard facilities are every student of these questions is aware. Then there is the accommodation for the sailors, and hospital accommodation as well. Nothing so disturbed the country in the late war as the conviction that enough had not been done for the sick and the wounded in the campaign. The hon. Member for Dundee is aware that the condition of the naval hospitals when he left office in 1895 was one that would not bear inspection by any competent person. Great expense has been incurred in providing proper hospital accommodation according to the later scientific ideas for the men of the Fleet. It is to the credit of Lord Goschen and the Board of Admiralty which succeeded his that they have surveyed the whole field of naval expenditure and that they have carried out their preparations in all its different lines—not in building ships without guns, nor in providing guns without men to work them, nor without reserves of stores necessary for their efficiency or the accommodation required for the men in sickness and health. The inference of the right hon. Member for East Wolverhampton is that our expenditure has exceeded that of the next two Powers by a considerable sum in the last four or five years, and he infers that we have set up a three-Power standard. My inference is quite different. When I find that our programme gives us only a margin in battleships of two over the combined two Powers, my inference is that we had a great leeway to make up, and that we have been making it up.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: Do you count cruisers?

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: No, Sir; I do not count armoured cruisers as battleships. If I did I should have to make a large addition to the other side. Of course, there has been a considerable margin of strength in cruisers. But why is that? We have 9,000,000 tons of shipping spread over the whole world to defend in case of war. We know that foreign Powers have built specially in order to be able to strike at that shipping in time of war; and what cannot be said by any other Power of its shipping is that upon our shipping depends the continued existence of our people, for we alone of the nations are dependent for sustenance upon sea-borne food. What is the amount of the shipping of the next two naval Powers? It is 1,500,000 tons as against our 9,000,000 tons. Does the right hon. Gentleman think that the same insurance which covers the smaller interest of other nations should be reasonably expected to cover our far greater and world-wide interest—an interest which involves the life or death of our people, while the interest of other nations involves but the issue of a greater or less pecuniary loss? We have not only to protect our sea-borne supply of food and raw material. We have to protect ourselves against invasion. Is there any other great Power which has reason to fear invasion from over sea? It is only because of our cruiser fleet and our torpedo fleet that we are able to regard invasion by great and crushing armies as a practical impossibility. The real error into which right hon. and hon. Gentlemen opposite have fallen is that of confining their comparison in the growth of expenditure on the Navy to a small number of years. Let them take a wider survey. During the twenty-four years ended 31st December, 1893, which practically coincides with the time in which our modern Fleet has been created, we have spent on new construction £116,000,000, as against an expenditure by France and Russia of £111,000,000. That is to say, we spent £5,000,000 more than France and Russia, or about £200,000 more per annum, and it is by that small margin of excess that we have secured that predominance in cruisers and torpedoes to which I have referred. The right hon. Gentleman said that Lord Goschen was not afraid to come down to the House and say that if foreign Powers made a reduction in their fleets we should be willing to make a corresponding reduction in our Fleet. It is not Lord Goschen alone who has made that statement on behalf of the Government. We have never been unwilling to make good that pledge. The offer has been repeated many a time on the floor of this House. But I do not think the right hon. Gentleman will suggest that the present is a favourable moment for pressing for a reduction in the naval forces of other Powers. It is true that measured in millions the cost involved in our naval and military preparations comes to an enormous sum. But we have also to consider our capacity to bear it. In 1864 the proportion which our defensive expenditure bore to our national income was 3·4 per cent. Now, notwithstanding the enormous burden which we are said to have since placed upon the country, the proportion is only 3·7 per cent. Considering how vital are the interests at stake, and how irreparable the injury which might be inflicted, I do not think that is an undue proportion to spend on the greatest of all insurances.

After all the question which concerns me most in my official capacity is—Is the burden of this expenditure intolerable? I think the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Wolverhampton was the first speaker to call attention to the fact that the burdens of the people are not only those imposed by the central Government. There are also the burdens of local taxation, and if the total burden were intolerable it might still remain the fact that reductions should be made elsewhere than in our insurance for national defence. I think there has been great exaggeration in this matter. It has been said that were we unhappily to be engaged in another great war, our financial resources would be unable to meet the strain. I think that is too pessimistic a view to take. God forbid that we should have to undergo another great war in our time. But if such an evil should arise, I, for one, refuse to assent to the statement that we should be either unwilling or unable to make fresh sacrifices to defend our honour or our interest. But is the burden intolerable? Consider how the expenditure has been met. 21·5 of the expenditure comes out of taxes upon transactions, and payments for services rendered, like stamps and the postal revenue; 34·5 comes from alcohol and tobacco. That is to say, it is raised from taxes which no one need pay if he does not wish, and which a great many people do not pay. 33·6 is levied from the direct taxpayer. So that of the whole sum only 10·4 per cent., or £15,500,000, is levied compulsorily from indirect taxpayers; £15,500,000—levied, of course, from those who pay direct taxation as well as from those who pay only indirect taxation—spread over a national income of something like £1,750,000,000, is the whole contribution that payers of indirect taxation need pay to the National Exchequer. Let me put it in another way. Our indirect taxation amounts to £1 11s. 2d. per head of the population. Of that £1 3s. 11d. per head is raised from alcohol and tobacco, which the poor man can escape if he wishes. What remains, that from which the poor man cannot escape, is only 7s. 3d. per head of the population, or less than 1¾d. per week. Is that an undue or intolerable burden in a country where practically every man has a vote and can take an active part in directing the policy of the nation? What is more—although I do not accept it as a principle of indefeasible right that the amount raised by direct taxation should exactly equal that raised from indirect taxation—by this Budget I have brought the relative proportions of indirect and direct taxation to what they were before the war, and the comparison is more favourable to indirect taxation than it was at the conclusion of the three years term of office of the right hon. Gentleman opposite. I do not believe that the burden is as intolerable as hon. Members opposite try to make out, and I certainly do not agree that the charge of general extravagance against the Government can be sustained.

Then it has been said that I have not uttered one word in favour of economy, and my silence on the point has been contrasted unfavourably with the utterances of my two predecessors in office. After all, I have not been very long responsible for the national finances. I do not know whether I may not be able to propose further economies in the future. But this I do know, that those who have spoken most of economy have probably been responsible for the largest increases, and from the time the right hon. Member for West Monmouth assumed office as Chancellor of the Exchequer on the last occasion down to the present day, inclusive, my Budget for the present year shows the least increase of taxation. I am excluding war expenditure. When the right hon. Gentleman was responsible in 1886–7 he added £2,500,000. In 1893–4 and onwards, during the three years in which he was then responsible, he added an average of £2,500,000 a year. My right hon. friend the Member for West Bristol, whose example I am bidden to imitate, added an average of nearly £5,000,000. My right hon. friend the Member for Croydon, whose appeal for economy contrasts so favourably with mine, added an even larger sum. I have succeeded in bringing the increase down to £2,000,000. [An Hon. Member: By not paying the deficit.] What is the use of the hon. Member saying that? The deficit of last year ought to have been provided for last year. It is not by what I have ventured to call lectures and admonitions to this House in general terms that any good result is achieved. My right hon. friend the Member for West Bristol said frankly that he did not believe any great reduction of expenditure was possible; what he warned the House against was the continued increase at the same rate that has been going on in recent years. Whether that increase has been bigger or less I am at any rate in accord with the right hon. Gentleman on this point—that if any of it is avoidable or wasteful, it should be condemned, and it is the business of a Chancellor of the Exchequer to prevent it. My quarrel with them is that I think they underrate the importance of the demands which are made upon us, that they have too little considered the methods by which the economies they expect can be made, and that they are carried away by hopes of economy which they themselves, unless they be false to the principles they have laid down, will be unable to realise.

The Leader of the Opposition has invented an ingenious theory which he has broached on two occasions to account for the size of the Estimates for which I am responsible this year. He says that on this side of the House there is no real desire for economy, because out of this great expenditure we, or I in particular, are anxious to build a platform for tariff reform. I think the right hon. Gentleman really attributes too great a degree of simplicity to my predecessors, who have been responsible for so much of this increase, if he thinks that the right hon. Member for West Bristol and the right hon. Member for Croydon have for the last six years been recklessly and wastefully spending money in order that my right hon. friend the Member for West Birmingham might have a greater expenditure on which to found his policy. The expenditure is large, it has increased, and it is not easy to reduce it. What I can say to the House, for myself and my colleagues, is that we are as keenly alive as any to the desirability that there should be not merely strict economy in the administration of the finances, but that there should be some relief for the taxpayer from his burden. But as long as we are responsible for the safety and security of the Empire, we cannot afford to buy present popularity by neglecting its defence or by leaving it unprepared for emergencies which may arise.

MR. ROBSON (South Shields) said the conditions of the benches durin the debate emphasised the responsibility of the Executive. It indicated that the House left the responsibility for our great expenditure where it must always lie — with the Executive Government. Undoubtedly the House of Commons was responsible in that it maintained in power a Government, capable of defending so great expenditure, but the primary responsibility lay with the Government that prepared the Estimates, that pledged itself and its responsibility and existence upon the efficiency and economy of those Estimates. What was the answer, either expressed or implied which every Minister gave when an hon. Member criticised an item with a view to its reduction? That the responsible Minister adopting the advice of his officials pledged his responsibility that the item was one which was not in excess of the requirements of the Department. That was the view put before the House of Commons upon which it was invited to act. That was the principle it acted upon, and it could scarcely act upon any other. That was the principle upon which hon. Members opposite entered the division lobby, without having heard the debate, to support the Government. Now an effort was being made to shift the responsibility of the Government on to the shoulders of the House. He thought that Parliament could do a great deal more than it had done or than it had been permitted to do in the way of reducing expenditure. Parliamentary criticism had been controlled in recent years to a very marked and ominous extent. In the old days when a Minister proposed an increase in the expenditure of his Department he had always to run the risk of justifying that increase. It was not too much to say that now that risk was very greatly diminished by the new Rules of procedure. In the old days a Minister had to surmount a double barrier—the barrier of the Treasury and the barrier interposed in his way by the criticism of the House. The barrier of the Treasury to increased expenditure had in recent years ceased to be of adequate effect. The Chancellor of the Exchequer in old times was anxious to encourage economy so as to remit taxes, but the Chancellor in times to come, if the country adopted the views of the present occupant of that office, might be relieved of the wish to avoid unpopularity by imposing new taxes. They had got a Chancellor now who did not conceal his opinion that by the imposition of new taxes we could add wealth and prosperity to many sections of the community and he could not understand the right hon. Gentleman's avowal of a desire in the concluding portion of his speech to avoid increased expenditure. Why was he anxious to avoid increased expenditure unless it was to avoid increased taxation? What, then, became of the theory of scientific taxation which was to add to the wealth of the community? The Chancellor of the future, whatever he might have been in the past, would only be an efficient barrier to high expenditure if he entertained opinions very different from those of the present Chancellor.

There was no stronger indication of the lack of Treasury control than the growth of Supplementary Estimates which had become almost the rule. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Bristol seemed to think that an economical Chancellor of the Exchequer would be preserved from most of those misfortunes if he had the support of the Prime Minister. That was indeed a most significant observation. He did not think anything had been said in the course of this debate to throw more light upon the great growth in recent expenditure than that remark. Undoubtedly the Treasury would be more efficient as an instrument for controlling expenditure if the Prime Minister gave the Chancellor of the Exchequer his support. But at the same time if there was the slightest fear that departmental extravagance would imperil Party unity, the Prime Minister would give the Chancellor of the Exchequer his support. There were economists on the opposite side of the House, but their enthusiasm for economy was not keen enough to give the Prime Minister uneasiness with regard to the unity of his Party. Until they were courageous enough they would never have the Prime Minister as an economist. Hon. Members opposite did not choose to make the Prime Minister an economist, but they were trying to make him a protectionist, which was quite a different thing. They had already seen in that debate the way in which Parliamentary control was hampered by the new Rules, but he could not believe it to be a mere coincidence that this enormous growth in expenditure should have taken place at an accelerated pace since the new Rules of procedure were adopted. He knew that those Rules were adopted for the convenience of the House. He was not going to suggest that they were absolutely necessary for the conduct of the business, but it was quite clear that they had diminished and impeded Parliamentary control. They had all observed the increasing habit of drawing into Supply nights questions of policy for which the House had no other opportunity of debate, and this had the inevitable effect of diminishing criticism on the point of economy. However, the House was still responsible, and the question was how it was to exercise its responsibility.

Let them just see how they were to judge the condition of things for which they were responsible. He would not follow the Chancellor of the Exchequer into detailed criticism of the various Estimates accounting for the increase of the expenditure. They must look at the total, and ask whether under any circumstances in times of peace they could afford such a total. The ordinary householder desirous of effecting retrenchment would come very badly out of an argument with his Prime Minister on an item of expenditure, especially if he were controversially inclined. He would say, "Look at the total; I am spending so much and I only get so much, and though your arguments, gathered from the cook and the butler and the coachman are unanswerable, I must choose between bankruptcy and retrenchment." As to the question whether they could afford their present expenditure, the Chancellor of the Exchequer had chosen a fallacious way of judging. He had told them they were only spending little more than 3 per cent. on their income, but no Chancellor of the Exchequer could tell them what their income was. He suggested that the question could be answered by considering the point which they had reached in their taxation. Could they in times of peace afford a shilling income-tax? He would go further and say that even in time of peace, if the shilling were applied for the removal of some of the hardships existing in the present social system he should not grumble at the burden which might light on the propertied classes. But putting aside that reason, could England, or any other country, afford a 5 per cent. income-tax on the gross income of the people in time of peace? He said it could not. Passing from the income-tax there was another tax, scarcely less conclusive, showing how they had gone too far. When any country found it necessary to put taxes on trade then he said it had reached a point of expenditure at which it was necessary to stop. He instanced the tax on coal as a tax on an export. A tax on exports was the worst. It contracted the area of our trade, and helped to lessen employment. It was a tax for which there was no excuse in time of peace. It was worse than living on their capital. It destroyed their capital. Taxes on trade were hampering and impeding to the effectiveness of trade and labour. Taxes on income and taxes on trade having reached a certain point were a sure sign they had reached the limit of expenditure. What was to be said of taxes on food? He ventured to think that when to meet expenditure it was necessary to put additional taxes on tea and sugar, a point had been reached at which they ought to stop at any cost. He knew there were Members on the other side who, if they did not want to increase the income-tax, wanted to increase the coal tax and the taxes on food.

It was idle for the Chancellor of the Exchequer himself to urge that he was as anxious as most in his position to avoid high expenditure. In fact, high expenditure was not only justified by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, but there were indications that the point at which Members of the Opposition desired to stop was the point at which some on the Ministerial side of the House desired to start. They wanted fresh fields to conquer. They wanted to add to taxation of tea and sugar, taxation of bread. In fact, high expenditure was an essential of a protective system, which was the system with which they were threatened in the future. Everybody knew that protection nearly broke down in America, because the expenditure was not sufficient, and the manufacturers of that country, calling patriotism to their aid, just as the manufacturers of this country called Imperialism to their aid, devised a gigantic and corrupt system of pension expenditure reaching no less than £37,000,000 a year. They raised their expenditure because they wanted an excuse for more taxes. Nothing was more perplexing to a protectionist Chancellor of the Exchequer than a surplus. The American manufacturers did not care about retrenchment, or call themselves progressive free-traders. They robbed their fellow-citizens with zest. The real danger to the country was that taxation might lose its unpleasantness. There was a great Party going about telling people that out of these great burdens private profit might be made. If hon. Members opposite got their way and a protective system was established, high expenditure, with its correlative of high taxation, would be looked on as beneficial, and retrenchment as not only superfluous, but absolutely mischievous.

However there was one subject on which the Chancellor of the Exchequer advocated economy. He spoke of the municipal bodies, and drew attention, in melancholy tones, to their increased indebtedness. The right hon. Gentleman said that the time had come when they should call a halt to municipal indbetedness. There was certainly a consistency in his attitude about that, because municipal bodies could not raise their money by those methods of scientific taxation which were so much approved of on the other side of the House, unless they should have a reintroduction of the *octroi* system into England. And, as things were going, he did not see why they should not have a reintroduction of that system which prevailed in those countries from which they were invited to take their fiscal policy. That was a very legitimate object of ambition for progressive free-traders. When that had been brought about there would be no longer any occasion to rebuke municipalities for excessive expenditure. Although in one week, when the Budget was introduced, we had the Chancellor of the Exchequer reproving the municipalities for increasing their liabilities, and although these liabilites had been incurred in respect of matters which might bring in a certain amount of profit to the community which incurred that expenditure, the very next week we had the Prime Minister coming along and pointing out that, as regarded another Bill, if the fund for compensation for licences was not adequate, the municipalities were at liberty to borrow immense sums. But as long as it was a question of spending money for light railways, education, or tramways, we must call a halt. There was one department in which perhaps the municipalities might be called upon to exercise economy. They on that side of the House had been challenged to say whether the grant in aid from the central to the local exchequer should be abolished. He was not entitled to speak with authority, but, so far as he was personally concerned, he should wish that that should be a primary object of our policy. These grants in aid were originally introduced to relieve property at the expense of industry, and now they had got to such a feature that they represented nearly 4d. on the income-tax; and that had been a great source of reckless economic administration. There was another system that might be applied which would avoid the difficulties with regard to the farmers. In Scotland half the rates were borne by the landlords. He did not know what the right hon. Gentleman would say in regard to that; but he hoped the House would not be debarred from referring strongly and severely to that very wasteful source of public expenditure. The Liberal Party, he dared say, would not be able to do much in that regard. In matters of legislation they were not their own masters. Even the country was not its own master in regard to ordinary legislation. But in the matter of finance the House of Commons were their own masters, and he hoped the Liberal Party would take up the work of restoring the finances of the country, which had been demoralised by nine years of profligacy and incompetence on the part of the Unionist Government.

Mr. ELLIOT (Durham) said he wished to put before the House one or two considerations as to the serious position in which the country found itself at the present moment. First of all he directed attention to the fact that, throughout the debate, very little interest seemed to have been shown in it. The absence of Members on the other side of the House had been conspicuous. At one point there were only two Members on the Front Opposition Bench and one Member behind them; while below the Gangway there were not more than half-a-dozen Members present. It could not be denied, however, that this question of increasing expenditure was of the greatest importance, and hon. Members were right in making a protest against it. The Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition might be regarded either as a denunciation of the Budget as being bad, or as a protest against what Liberals alleged was the extravagance of the Government. At the same time it did the Chancellor of the Exchequer great credit that so little fault had been found with his Budget from beginning to end. He was afraid that that being so some little disappointment would have been caused to the right hon. Member for Sleaford; but that right hon. Gentleman had professed no disappointment on that account, because he seemed to think that though the Government were pledged against the corn tax up to the next general election, there was a general understanding that after the next general election the Party led by the Prime Minister would declare themselves in favour of his policy. The hon. Gentleman who had just sat down had found it easy to criticise the proposals of the Government. He need not remind his hon. and learned friend that the income-tax and the war were wedded together. We had to pay our way, and the moment our guns had ceased firing we could not knock off expenditure. Looking at the truth and the substance of the matter the great increase in our national expenditure during the last few years had been directly or indirectly due to the South African war. But it should be remembered that they could not, immediately peace was declared, reduce expenditure which had been increased directly and indirectly by the South African War. He could not see any prospect of Civil Service expenditure being diminished, because every Department, year by year, had more business to transact. Take the Aliens Bill, there would be more salaries to pay, more printing, more paper to be used. Hon. Members seemed to forget that they could not take out of the Treasury more than they put into it. He was not going into the question of the necessity of the South African War—he still had his own opinion on that matter—but that war entailed a gigantic expenditure, and that war had led to a great public misconception of what it would produce. They had learnt that it was not a short cut to the establishment of happy relations between the two races. Until they had restored by wise statesmanship and patient consideration happy relations between the two races they would have a large military expenditure, and it would be many years before they would be able to reduce military expenditure to anything like what it was before that unfortunate war began.

It was all very well to say that their burdens were heavy, but they should think of the incalculable risks the nation would run if their defensive means were not adequate to those risks. Even if hon. Gentlemen opposite were in office they might find it incumbent on them to send another 50,000 troops to South Africa. Preparation should be made in advance, and a long view should be taken of such matters if anything like adequate safety and security for the country was to be assured. The whole position had been changed since the South African War. Good sentiments and good feeling between this country and neighbouring Powers ought to be restored; but they should not take an immediate view of the situation only. Not since 1815 had an European war lasted for more than two years. This country could not build a great Fleet in six months and send it to sea. The country must depend on preparations made beforehand, much more than in other days; and any Government, Liberal or Conservative, would deserve the utmost censure if, in order to secure popularity by reducing taxation, they were to leave the country open to a disaster which many generations might not see the end of. Therefore he associated himself with the efforts that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had been making not to diminish the strength of the Army and Navy. It could not be denied that for years the Navy had been the protector of the peace of Europe. What was to be avoided above all things was an oscillation between exaggerated alarms and a state of mind in which war was supposed to be impossible. He had heard, with considerable dissatisfaction, censure passed on the Government for having at a critical moment purchased two Chilian warships; but that purchase was only evidence of the determination of the Government to use its strength —and money was part of its strength— to make preparations which might be necessary. He should be sorry if any remarks he had addressed to the House should suggest that he had any doubt as to the necessity of supporting the Government when it produced a well thought-out scheme. He would indeed be loth to take on himself the responsibility of declaring hostility, for instance, to the purchase of the Chilian warships. It was probable that the time might come when the taxation of bread and butter and imported manufactures—the policy of making things dear in the interests of a class—might be taken up by a Unionist Government, and until that was disproved by a half-dozen words from the Prime Minister he would not feel full confidence in his right hon. friend. That battle might have to be fought out, but it could not be fought out on the present Amendment. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had to provide for gigantic expenditure; he had to raise gigantic revenue to meet it; and did it in a simple fashion. It was always disagreeable to have to pay; but there was no sense in looking at one side of the problem only. The hon. and learned Member had denounced protectionism. But there was none in this Budget, and that battle had not to be fought now. It was a Budget which he could heartily support, as having been proved to be adequate to the difficulties of the situation.

*MR. KEARLEY (Devonport) said that during the debate a quantity of figures had been used to show how expenditure had grown during various periods; and comparison between various periods to prove that expenditure had been enormously increased. No hon. Member, however, had referred to the question as to how the present burden of taxation had affected the trade of the country, and he proposed to confine himself to that argument. The increased burden of taxation affected the trade of the country in two ways. In the first place the conduct of trade was affected by these repeated alterations of the duties on commodities. The tobacco tax was reduced in 1889 and increased in the following year. In 1900 the tea duty was increased twopence a pound. In the next year the sugar duty of a halfpenny a pound was imposed, carrying in its train eighty other duties on eighty other commodities of which it formed part, and in the next year there was the corn tax, which involved duties on seventy-five other articles. Now the tea duty was raised again. The effect on the conduct of business was most serious. It upset the whole machinery, involved the locking up of an increased amount of capital, and led to general disorganisation. But what was of far more importance was that it affected the volume of trade. Since the sugar tax was imposed there had been a falling off of 310,000 tons of imported sugar, instead of an annual increase of 40,000 tons. Every industry in the country had been affected. The 430,000 tons by which the imports had fallen off would have been fetched by British ships, landed in British docks, carried over British railways, and handled by British brokers and merchants, and all these people would have been so much the better off. This made perfectly clear the fact that the country had reached a point at which it could not continue to bear increased taxation. If it could, there would have been no diminution of consumption. It was obvious that there had been husbanding of means on the part of consumers who could not indulge so freely in the necessaries of life as they otherwise would do. The falling off, moreover, was in quality as well as quantity and extended to tea as well as to sugar, and the tea duties had affected seriously the importation of British-grown tea and increased undesirable imports from other countries. The decrease for Ceylon tea in the last four years amounted to 20,000,000 lbs., which had been partially supplemented by the importation of 10,000,000 of cheap and nasty tea from China and countries other than British. That was not beneficial to the interests of our dependencies abroad. It was not very much to be wondered at that these taxes brought about a diminution of consumption. The nation's trade was not made by the purchases of the well-to-do. It was the daily and weekly purchases of the wage-earning classes, comprising three-fourths of the population, which made up the trade of a nation and enabled it to keep up large armies and navies, and bear the burden of this ever-increasing expenditure.

The outcome of his own practical business experience was that any increase of price was instantly followed by a diminution of consumption. If Chancellors of the Exchequer who of late had been so free in increasing taxes on commodities would bear that in mind, they would be more disposed than they appeared to be to devise some other means of raising taxes than by imposing them on food products. The amount they yielded to the Exchequer did not represent half the effect that the wage-earner felt. The consumer not only paid the tax but also every profit and expense incidental to it, and the extra burden was at least 50 per cent. in excess of the Exchequer receipts. The course of a nation ought to be identical with that which they as individuals pursued themselves. They had to cut their coats according to their cloth, and there must be a limit to this increase of expenditure. There had not been a single word of encouragement from anyone speaking in an official capacity to lead them to expect that they might look forward for a diminution in this huge expenditure. We were tauntingly asked what we wished to cut down. His reply was that better administration would save millions; for example we were still feeling the burden of the reckless purchase of remounts at £50 a head which were worth perhaps £17 and of the wild cat Somaliland and other filibustering expeditions. If the Government did not want to see the trade of the country seriously crippled they would have to recognise that we had really reached our limit and that there must be a stop somewhere. The Chancellor had tried to wave the flag, and he called his critics Little Englanders, and said they wanted to reduce the Navy, but he thought the country apprehended the real truth of the matter and realised that this Government had outlived its usefulness. They pretended they still enjoyed the confidence of the people. As a matter of fact the country was waiting for it outside. They only wanted the opportunity. If right hon. Gentlemen opposite were patriotic, and had the interests of the country really at heart, the sooner they gave it the opportunity of dismissing them the better it would be for the welfare of the nation.

And, it being half-past Seven of the clock, the debate stood adjourned until this Evening's Sitting.

EVENING SITTING.

FINANCE BILL.

[Second Reading.]

Order read, for resuming adjourned debate on Amendment to Question [16th May], "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Which Amendment was—

> "To leave out from the word 'That,' to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "this House, having regard to the heavy burden of taxation proposed by this Bill in a time of peace, deems it necessary to declare its condemnation of the large and continuous increase of the national expenditure in recent years.' "—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Sir EDWARD SASSOON (Hythe) said he found it difficult to follow the hon. Member in his comprehensive and indiscriminate onslaught on the financial scheme of the Chancellor of the Exchequer and, by implication, upon the whole policy of the Government. But in common with everybody in the House and in the country, he could not but feel deeply concerned at the continually increasing and apparently unlimited tale of expenditure. Nothing had been suggested to bring that expenditure more effectively under the control of the House. To an ordinary observer and student of public finance it was difficult to discover the ground for this increase of our Estimates. It could hardly be explained by the increase of population. There was no necessary or recognised equation between the increase of expenditure and the increase of population. In 1893–4 the population of this country increased by 3,000,000 and in the same year the expenditure increased by £12,500,000. In 1903–4, while the population had only increased by 3,750,000, or 750,000 more than the increase shown in 1893–4, the expenditure had increased by £58,500,000. The figures were appalling, but was that expenditure unnecessary? Persons with more courage than responsibility might say it was, but he agreed with the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer and said that no man could put his finger on any item and say that it could be reduced or done away with. He agreed that we must have a strong Navy, and there was a good deal of force in the contention that the two-Power standard should only apply to battleships and not to cruisers, for the reason that, with the exception of France, foreign Powers had few possessions oversea to protect and guard, whilst on the other hand we were under very heavy obligations to protect our huge mercantile marine, our sources of supply, and our kinsmen across the sea. He mentioned these facts to accentuate the difficulties in which the House found itself in considering this expenditure, and not to demonstrate the justice of the Estimates. It was obvious that when they came to the Army they had less substantial ground to go on. We could not expect to vie and compete with foreign Powers in huge territorial armies, and therefore the Government would do wisely in limiting the establishment of the Army to the smallest point consistent with Imperial obligations.

He was, however, at one with those who objected to the additional taxation of tea; that was an altogether retrograde tax and must be regarded with grave misgivings. In so far as this fresh impost would tend to raise the price of the higher grades, and consequently to fall on the well-to-do classes, he had not a word to say; but the effect it would necessarily have of rendering the low-grade leaf higher in cost to the poorest of the poor was much to be deplored. Was it denied that the price would be raised? If so, those who did deny it must admit that the dealers would have to recoup themselves by adulterating their wares. His belief was that the incidence of this further tax would have to be shared between the consumer and producer. And who were these producers? They were fellow-subjects of their own who sent practically 93 per cent. of all the teas consumed in this country; who had, by dint of considerable expenditure of capital, of laying down machinery and plant of a costly description and by the display of resource and ingenuity, built up this interesting and important industry. They had also had to bear the racket of the artificially-raised rupee and of having to pay a higher scale of wages, owing to the standard of comfort and of living having appreciably risen within the last twenty years. What a strange and scarcely creditable commentary it was on the policy pursued by this House—and both Parties were tarred with the same brush—that, while they insisted on our maintaining the doctrines of free trade against India's own well-considered wishes and convictions, and while they insisted on her Government avoiding the merest scintilla of protection, or of protective tendency, even in cases such as the lower kind of cotton fabrics, where by no stretch of the imagination could any protective effect be proved to ensue, they were about to endorse the imposition of a tax on tea which, on the most numerous category of imports, could not be less than 100 per cent.

The present situation was due to the fact that the late Chancellor of the Exchequer, in an ebullition of somewhat misplaced generosity, took off a penny too much on the income-tax, and, in a still weaker moment, abolished the small registration tax upon corn which was easy of collection, harrassed nobody, and therefore was the most ideal tax that could be levied. It was a thousand pities that the Chancellor of the Exchequer disdained other sources of revenue, because, he supposed, they were out of the beaten track; in which circumstances tea fell an easy prey to the grasping exactions of the Treasury. Was the right hon. Gentleman quite sure that he had exhausted all other possible and innocuous expedients? There was, for instance, the article of aerated and mineral waters. Something like 3,500,000,000 half-pints were, it was estimated, consumed annually in the United Kingdom. If the Chancellor of the Exchequer taxed the waters sold at 2s. a dozen 1d. per dozen, and the water sold at a higher price 3d. per dozen, he would obtain the £2,000,000 of which he stood in need. Then there were the imports of wasteful articles of luxury—such as diamonds, feathers and plumage, lace, expensive skins and furs. As regarded diamonds, the statistical abstract showed an import of only £46,000 for 1902, but that was a ludicrously low figure, and he should think the amount would be nearer £2,000,000. Feathers and lace, seal skins, and furs amounted to over £6,000,000, so that a tax of 3 per cent., excluding diamonds, would bring in enough to balance the Budget. If these suggestions were rejected, he urged the right hon. Gentleman to consider the possibility of giving an *ad valorem* character to the additional tax on tea, so as to mitigate, if not avert, the severe incidence of the tax upon the poorest of the poor. The criticisms upon the Budget from the other side of the House had been singularly sterile. It was all very well for hon. Members to say they would only prescribe when called in, but he thought it was their duty to endeavour to make a Budget, which was admittedly framed on normal and traditional lines, as satisfactory as possible, rather than try to manufacture Party capital out of it. Until they did so he would have no difficulty in reconciling his own criticisms with support of the Bill.

*Mr. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe) said the general trend of the remarks of the hon. Baronet, who, from his wide experience in commercial affairs, was always listened to with interest, showed that he was alarmed at the magnitude of the national expenditure. The hon. Baronet had intimated that there had been a great sterility in suggestions and proposals from the Liberal Benches as to how the revenue which it was necessary to raise should be obtained. It did not lie with the Opposition to make proposals of that kind; they were not in office and it was not for them, who did not know and had not the information which the Government possessed, to bring forward any proposals. He was anxious to call attention to a different and wider aspect of national finance. During the half century previous to the last great settlement of the franchise and redistribution questions, the House was predominantly Liberal, and during the eighteen years since then it had been predominantly Conservative. If it were shown that the latter period had been marked by a policy which had led to an enormous increase of expenditure he thought the Conservatives would admit that that was their responsibility. There were signs that a new era was about to be entered upon, and that the period to which he had referred, with some of its great characteristics, was coming to an end. He could not understand hon. Members apologising for quoting figures in this debate. Finance was based upon figures. He remembered that Mr. Gladstone used to say that of all inanimate things Consols were the most intelligent, and that figures revealed the industrial and commercial state of the country in a way that nothing else did. It was admitted on all hands that the growth of expenditure was alarming, if not appalling; but even more serious than the growth itself was the rate of that growth. According to Sir Henry Fowler's Return, the expenditure during the financial year ending 31st March, 1887, was £78,000,000; during the year ending 31st March, 1896, £86,000,000; and during the year ending 31st March, 1905, £126,000,000; therefore, during the first period of nine years the rate of growth was 11 per cent., whereas in the second period of nine years it was 50 per cent. That was the way the country was drifting and its seriousness could not be exaggerated.

There had been a significant admission made in the course of the debate, that we had now reached the limit of the taxable capacity of the people. The Chancellor of the Exchequer in his reply had mentioned the national income as £1,700,000,000 or £1,800,000,000, but doubts had been expressed as to the accuracy of that figure. An interesting Return was got out for Mr. Gladstone's Budget speech of 1881 showing the population, revenue, and expenditure. He wished very much that some revised Return showing those figures could be presented, for they were most interesting and most vital. He believed that taxation was growing at a much faster rate than either the population or the ability of the people to contribute, and such a condition of affairs was much to be deprecated. Another interesting point was the relation of the various heads of expenditure one to another. He took the expenditure under three heads. Under the first head he took all that was paid by way of interest or repayment of debt; under the second head all Civil expenses; and under the third head expenditure on the Navy and Army. Out of every £100 of expenditure in 1887, £32 went in interest and repayment of debt; £24 for the Civil Service, and £44 for armaments; in 1896 the corresponding figures were £30, £27, and £53; whereas £23 was now spent on interest and repayment of debt, £26 on the Civil Service, and £51 on the Navy and Army. Surely it would be admitted that to increase expenditure on armaments relatively to that spent on civil affairs showed a nation was travelling on a wrong road.

But the whole question, as all would admit, rested on policy. During the eighteen years that the Conservative Party had been predominant this country had entered on an unparalleled course of expansion abroad, and the dominant note had been a certain restless aggressiveness. He would quote in connection the words of a very high authority indeed—

> "For the last twelve years you have been laying your hands with almost frantic eagerness on every tract of territory adjacent to your own or desirable from any point of view you thought it desirable to take. That has had two results. The first result is this, that you have excited to an almost intolerable degree the envy of other colonising nations, and that in the case of many countries, or several countries rather,

that were friendly to you, you can reckon, in consequence of your colonial policy, not on their active benevolence but on their active malevolence."

This was strong language coming from such a statesman as the Earl of Rosebery — "malevolence" on the part of other countries must have had its influence in this need for greater naval expenditure. By this territorial extension during the eighteen years to which he had referred 60,000,000 people had been added to the Empire. It must be borne in mind that these and indeed millions of the coloured races which were included in the Empire were governed not as self-governing colonies, by their own free will and consent, but in the last resort by force. That was a great factor in the increase of the Army during the last eighteen years. Lord Salisbury had spoken in strong terms against the policy of expansion. He also noticed that the late Secretary for India had lately declared, and the Prime Minister had agreed, that this country had quite as much on its hands in the way of territory and people in Asia as it could manage. The most potent influence in this policy was the ex-Colonial Secretary. That right hon. Gentleman had over and over again claimed that it was to the advantage of this country to add to the Empire these peoples and areas, that it was good for trade, and what not. In regard to trade, there was no proof whatever that that belief had been realised. Trade had not developed in proportion to these additional responsibilities. Not even in Egypt, with all the advantages of Lord Cromer's master-hand, had British trade increased so fast as that of other nations. Something had been said as to Committee of Supply in relation to national finance. But he did not believe that debates in Committee of Supply would have any effective control over national expenditure, nor had he any faith in setting up new Committees. They would rather fritter away the responsibility of the Government. It might be an old-fashioned notion, but he preferred that the Government of the day should have full and entire control over, and be responsible for, their Estimates.

The matter really resolved itself into the question of whether the money spent upon armaments could be lessened. That was the real crux of the matter. He was not an expert in naval matters, but the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Bristol said the other day that no sufficient reason had been given for the increase in the Naval Estimates this year; and such an opinion coming from a Gentleman with the experience and ability of the right hon. Gentleman was quite sufficient for him. He did entreat the Government to see whether there was not an opening for making an agreement with other Powers for the reduction of armaments. He agreed with the Prime Minister that the preservation of the honour of our country could be consistent with the preservation of the peace of the world. He regarded the Amendment as a pledge that the Liberal Party when it came into power would endeavour to reduce our national expenditure, and particularly in regard to armaments. The nation wanted, and he hoped they would soon have, a return, to the spirit and methods of Gladstonian finance. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had said there was not much interest taken in the debate if the number of Members in attendance could be taken as a criterion. The right hon. Gentleman might have added that the absentees were mainly on the Government side of the House.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said that his point was that hon. Members opposite were contending that a grave crisis had arisen in the financial affairs of the country, and yet there were not twenty members of the Opposition present to emphasise the gravity of the crisis.

*MR. JOHN ELLIS said he would leave the right hon. Gentleman to settle the exact number of Members in attendance, but it was the fact that there had been a much larger attendance on the Opposition than on the Government side of the House. No doubt the right hon. Gentleman's reason was that on the Ministerial side there was satisfaction and on the Opposition side there was dissatisfaction with the present state of things. This Parliament had been distinguished by its want of attention to debate from the Government benches. It was a significant fact that the Ministerial Benches had been constantly empty during the debates. He thought there was another reason for that, and it was to be found in the fact that this was a moribund House of Commons. [Ministerial cries of "No, no!"] That was so, and that was why the attendance of hon. Members opposite was so poor. They were not interested in what was going on because many of them did not expect to return to the House of Commons. He supported this Amendment because he believed that the House of Commons should be mainly occupied with considering the wants, wishes, and feelings of the dwellers in the British Isles. They were the people upon whom lay the enormous responsibilities of empire, and upon whose character and capacity the whole of the structure depended. He hoped and believed that the efforts of the new Parliament which would be elected before long would be mainly turned in that direction.

Mr. CUST (Southwark, Bermondsey): said he did not think it was necessary for him to answer, at any great length, the speech of the hon. Member who had just sat down. The hon. Member began his remarks by defining the attitude of the Opposition, and he accused the Government of sterility. He would venture to point out to the hon. Member that it was not only the duty of the Opposition to criticise, but also to correct, and if they only criticised without correction, they were but barren fig trees and cumbered the ground. The only suggestion which had been made by the hon. Member was that the present expenditure of the country ought to be diverted into other channels. He thought that criticism was somewhat cryptic. The hon. Member made an accusation against Unionists as being responsible for the growth of the expenditure, because they had been the predominant Party for the last eighteen years. He would venture to point out that the Unionists could not have remained a predominant power in the country unless they had had the support of the majority of the House of Commons and of the electors. Therefore he thought the growing expenditure was justified, for otherwise the Government could not have existed. As for the figures into which the hon. Member had plunged, they were interesting, but they were all admitted, and they all knew in what direction the expenditure had gone. It seemed to him that the interesting speech to which they had just listened, showed once more that there was something unreal, something of pose in this blind frontal attack on expenditure. Speaker after speaker, like phantom after phantom, with the Leader of the Opposition in the part of Banquo, rose up eloquent in criticism, but dumb in suggestion. For instance, the hon. Member for Oldham, who was pleased yesterday to amuse himself at the expense of the House, and to amuse the House at the expense of himself, talked as if economy was the be-all and end-all of national existence. With great respect to his hon. friend he wished to say that that seemed to him to be mere nonsense. Of course, all money was wealth, but all wealth was certainly not money. The capitalised value of Russia, for instance, was infinitely greater than the capitalised value of Japan, but it was Japan's timely expenditure upon what the Opposition had called wasted armaments which had placed Japan in the advantageous position in which she stood in relation to her wealthier enemy.

Everybody wanted low taxes and everybody wanted economy, and nothing was more likely to secure popularity than a loud cry for retrenchment. At the same time he wished to point out that nothing was more liable to cause panic retrenchment. The two tendencies of panic retrenchment and panic expenditure were bound inevitably to succeed each other. He thought that the history of the last century showed that panic economy was fully as dangerous as panic extravagance. To-day, as after every war, there was, he would not say a panic, but a passion for economy, and it was, perhaps, worth while to consider the position in general facts and not simply as regarded the figures. Many of the facts seemed to have been ignored altogether, and the figures had been exaggerated. One obvious question with regard to the increased expenditure must be considered, and that question was how far this increase of expenditure was singular to ourselves, and was it normal or abnormal? It was generally admitted that when a man or a business or a nation increased its establishment it also increased its expenditure. Whether the increased establishment was desirable, or necessary, or not, might be another question, but that question was not raised in this debate. The fact was, that the establishment had been raised and they were now dealing solely with the expenditure. They were merely told that economy for economy's sake was a very desirable quality and characteristic. It seemed to him that, in what the right hon. Gentleman opposite had called the Gladstonian epoch, there had been a certain confusion between the word "Retrenchment and the word "Reform," and they had become almost interchangeable terms. But retrenchment was not necessarily reform, and very often it was exactly the opposite of reform. For instance, in the new Army scheme the cutting down of the Auxiliary Forces to such an extent as to seriously impair their value and efficiency as a military body was not a measure of reform but an absolutely riotous measure of false economy. It was worth while in this respect to consider what other countries were doing in order to see whether we were singular, or normal, or abnormal. The House ought to remember that the whole modern tendency was towards increased establishment and a larger central expenditure, over a more widely expanding area of government. Centralisation and expansion must of necessity mean expenditure, and of the new order of things he would suggest that Germany and Italy were two quite new spending centres, whereas the United States, France, Russia, and Great Britain were continuously expanding Empires. He wished the House not to altogether forget that expansion of territory and government ultimately meant new sources of wealth. They had now the markets of Canada and Australia and the Colonies, which were a great source of wealth and credit.

There was also another reason for the rise of expenditure during the last thirty years. There were periods when every business and every nation and every spending body had to go through a certain number of years of re-equipment, and the further that day of re-equipment was postponed the larger would be the arrears and the greater would be the outlay required to bring it about. He would quote three instances in totally different spheres which proved this point. In the first place he would give the case of the American railways. They were originally built on light rails, with light ballast, light trucks, and light engines, but as the railways expanded and the trade enlarged a period of re-equipment had to be faced. Consequently heavier rails, ballast, trucks, and engines had to be provided, and during the time that this conversion was taking place, involving an enormous outlay, the dividends of the companies practically came to an end. But since that re-equipment had come into full working order the dividends had largely increased and were now more than repaying the enormous expenditure for re-equipment. In the second place, he would take the case of the British Navy. The Navy, they had been told, was making to-day abnormal demands upon the public purse not very far behind the requirements of the National Debt. The outlay they were asked to meet to-day was only the logical fulfilment of Lord Spencer's naval programme which was brought in under a Liberal Government. He would take as his third case an instance which occurred only yesterday. As they would have observed from the newspapers, there had been a sudden awakening of the Austrian Government, and they had discovered that their armaments were not up to the European standard, and as soon as they were satisfied that they would be placed at a disadvantage in this respect in case of war, they brought in a demand for £16,000,000, which of course might possibly be dead loss, but which the Austrian Government recognised as a necessary insurance for the future security of the country. He quoted that simply to illustrate what he believed to be the truth, namely, that the cause of the great expenditure in this country during the last thirty years was very largely a subsidiary cause and was due to the fact that this country had been passing through a period of re-equipment not only in regard to the Army and Navy and education, but in all other branches of the spending services; and although it might not be necessary to go on for ever spending at such a high rate, such expenditure had been justified up to the present time. He had no doubt that the high rate of expenditure from 1885 to 1903 was very largely due to the starvation of the expenditure between the years 1859 and 1885.

He had made a comparison between the expenditure of this country with other countries during the last ten years. This was an extremely difficult task, because the comparison could only be made piecemeal, for France, wisely or unwisely, kept practically no accounts, and Germany adopted the "federal" system, under which her accounts were very complex things to study. The United States adopted the States system, and that again made it a country almost impossible to compare with our own. There were, however, certain points worth noting, and he would take, in the first place, the case of France. During the last thirty years the ordinary Budget in France had more than doubled. This meant more than it did in the case of our own Budget, because the ordinary Budget of France excluded what they called "special" budgets, such as the cost of the expedition to China, subventions to various industries and trades, and also what were known as the "extra-Budgetary" expenses, such as railways, which from 1874 to 1899 amounted to 1,315,000,000 francs or about £52,000,000, or equal to about £2,000,000 a year. The Budget of France also excluded the Colonial Budgets, which were very difficult to estimate, but which amounted, at least for the period he was considering, to 110,000,000 francs, or about £4,000,000, excluding Algeria. This made the total Budget of France, as far as could be gained from the French authorities at least, £160,000,000 or £170,000,000 a year, and that had been doubled in thirty years. There was some explanation for that expenditure on account of the increased establishment which had been going on in France as in this country, and in the same way the wealth of France had been expanding in order to meet the expenditure.

If he was not wearying the House he would like to make a comparison in regard to the National Debt. Hon. Gentlemen opposite had sobbed at large over the additions to the National Debt caused by the war, but in the year 1892 the French National Debt was 21,000,000,000 francs, and the interest upon that sum was 739,000,000 francs. In 1902, the French National Debt stood at 30,000,000,000 francs and the interest paid upon it was 1,200,000,000 francs. Therefore, the British National Debt was £770,000,000, with a charge of £23,000,000, as compared with the French National Debt, excluding local debt amounting to £1,214,000,000, with a charge of £48,500,000. In other words, to put it quite clearly, the French public debt represented in capital £31 3s. per head of the population, with a charge for interest of £1 5s. per head of the population, whilst the British public debt was represented in capital by £18 17s. per head of the population, and the charge for interest 12s. 10d. per head. France was the only country whose expenditure and income could be taken as like to our own, but the task was rendered difficult because France kept no accurate account. However much expenditure was exaggerated in Opposition speeches or in speeches made by alarmist Conservatives, he thought the record of public burdens in the comparison he had made with France showed that from the actual figures this country had nothing to fear by a fair comparison. Even in the United States there was sufficient evidence of a similar expansion of expenditure, due largely, but not entirely, to an expansion in establishment. In 1892, the expenditure in the United States was $345,000,000; in 1903, $640,000,000; in 1904, the estimate was $661,000,000; and for 1905 the estimate was $727,000,000. This showed that whereas in the year 1892 the expenditure in the United States was $345,000,000, in 1905 the estimated amount required was $727,000,000, or nearly double the amount required in 1892. It should be remembered that this was in addition to the State taxes, which for 1890 where put at $470,000,000. He did not say that these figures were conclusive, but he did say that they were illustrative and suggestive. His object had been to show that the recent rise in expenditure had not been merely due to a mad spirit of waste and extravagance, but the expenditure had reasons and limits. The outlay was a reasoned one and was limitable.

There was one other point he wished to raise. It should be remembered that they were not taxing the same estate between 1898 and 1902 as during the period between 1883 and 1897. Twenty years had elapsed and they were now taxing a totally different property. During that period wages had risen 50 per cent. The inland revenue had risen 40 per cent. Smaller profits and salaries which did not come within the purview of Somerset House were calculated to amount to £200,000,000 a year, and the total income of the country made up by all these figures was now very close upon £2,000,000,000 a year. We were now taxing that amount as compared with £1,400,000,000 twenty years ago. The national income showed an increase of 38 per cent., and the population an increase of 15 per cent. He thought all these considerations ought to be taken into account in forming a judgment on the increased expenditure of the country. He did not say that there was no cause for serious inquiry, but he did say that there was no cause for panic or trembling at our national expenditure. It seemed to him that any inquiry into national expenditure ought to go hand in hand with an inquiry into the system of taxation, its incidence on various classes, and above all its possible and equitable expansion. At present our hands were tied. Apart from a few necessary articles on one side, and the income-tax, which was strongly condemned by Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Cobden, we had absolutely no new sources of supply to fall back upon. A graduated income-tax had been quite possible in Prussia, and he believed that a wide increase of graduated direct and indirect taxation might ensure the elasticity of our future finance. New taxes, protectionist or not, would always be unpopular, but the House should remember that popular or not, they simply implied a wider distribution of the burden of public taxation. But they must increase the possible area of taxation, and they could not do that in a moment. If they had a wide field of possible taxation, if the expenditure was carefully presented in a way they would be able to understand, and if they threw away formulas for common sense, he humbly thought there need be no fear for the financial future.

*MR. GODDARD (Ipswich) said he wished to offer some practical suggestions for reducing the very heavy expenditure they were now considering. Nobody who had listened to the debate would say that a discussion on the expenditure of the country was either untimely or unneeded. The watching of expenditure was one of the principal functions of the House of Commons, and it demanded far closer attention than had hitherto been given to it. They found all sorts of questions raised on proposals of taxation, and yet, after all, taxation was not so important as expenditure. Taxation was the outward and visible sign of expenditure, and, argue as they might as to the incidence of taxation, as to the kind of articles that ought to be taxed, and as to the persons upon whom taxes would fall, taxation depended on expenditure, and expenditure in its turn depended on policy. Policy was a matter for which the Government of the country was responsible, and anybody who had followed the history of the country since this Government came into office in 1895 on the question of cordite, would see that it had been a very bleeding time for the people. Soon after the Government came into office the first step in the downward grade of extravagant policy was made in connection with the doles. There was money enough, at all events, to expend in the interest of their friends—those whom they wished to keep on their side while in office, and after they went out of office. That alone involved the country in an expenditure of £3,000,000. They were told that there was no use grumbling about taxes, that they passed the Estimates, and that they must find the money to pay for them. That was the one argument which had been used against the Amendment. There was a great deal of truth in that, but he would ask how much control had Parliament over the Estimates? He could not help saying that the policy of the Government on the question of the Estimates had never been favourable to economy, or the reduction of expenditure. The debates in Committee of Supply were limited to twenty-one or twenty-three days, and he thought that this arrangement lent itself to extravagance. How many Votes were passed by the House under the guillotine without comment or debate? In 1903 they ran through Votes after ten o'clock amounting to £5,552,896 without any comment. In 1902 they passed Votes under the guillotine Rule for over £12,000,000, and that included £2,317,800 on the Navy, £758,600 on the Army, and £2,440,185 on Revenue Services. In 1901, under the same Rule, they passed Votes for upwards of £67,000,000 in something like an hour, that sum including £14,209,300 on the Navy, £44,988,600 on the Army, and £2,884,880 on Revenue Services. These Votes never received the slightest Parliamentary criticism, and in view of those facts he asked—What was the use of the Government asking hon. Members to deal with expenditure on the Estimates?

It was this very Government that set up a Committee to deal with the question of public expenditure. Why had the Government, if they had any real regard for economy, paid no heed to the recommendations of the Committee on Public Expenditure? One recommendation was that the Estimates should be submitted to some kind of Committee. With regard to the Army and Navy Votes, he could not help thinking that the diversion of money from one Vote to another was a dangerous practice and led to extravagance. He found that under this system very large sums had been devoted to purposes which had never been considered by Parliament at all. It might be said that this was done in accordance with a long established custom of this House, and that the Government were not responsible, but he could not help feeling that this Government were in an exceptional position, having been long in office, with a large majority behind them, and if their policy had made for economy they could have altered the system. In the third Report of the Public Accounts Committee, 1900, the following words appeared—

> "Estimates of cost submitted for Parliamentary sanction should be such as the House of Commons can accept as final."

That was sound sense, but it had never been acted on, and never would be so long as they allowed the money voted for one purpose to be diverted to another. To illustrate the working of this system, he mentioned that in the Army Estimates for 1901–2, under Vote 10, Works, etc., there were twenty-two items which were largely exceeded, with Treasury sanction. The excess sometimes was as much as 100 per cent. on the money voted by Parliament. There were seven cases of money voted by Parliament, amounting to £17,800, of which not a penny was spent. There were four cases of work begun without estimate at all and merely on Treasury sanction. He contended that was making Parliamentary control a mere mockery The Comptroller and Auditor-General had called the Committee's attention to a case where the House had passed an estimate for £14,019 for three lighters, while the actual cost was £28,306, being more than double what the House voted. In any ordinary man's business that would spell ruin. What was the explanation? That it was a convenient time to build a fourth lighter and that, instead of the excess being 102 per cent., it was only 49 per cent. A new lighter was ordered, for which an Estimate was never brought before Parliament. By this extravagant system, if the Admiralty came to the Treasury and declared it was urgent to begin to build a new battle-ship at once—it would cost £1,000,000, but only £100,000 would be spent this year and that sum had been saved from other Votes—the Treasury had power to sanction the expenditure, and commit the country to a new battleship, though it had never been considered or sanctioned by Parliament. He would instance another case. A store was built at Gibraltar for the Navy, and the cost on the Navy Vote was £42,000, but it was found to be too damp for holding ammunition, and it was converted into a cold meat store at an additional cost of £47,000, making a total of £89,000, of which the Army paid £23,000 and the Navy £66,000. What relation was there between that expenditure and the Estimate laid before Parliament? This removal of Parliamentary control was a most harmful thing in connection with our finances. The knowledge that surpluses of one Vote could be used to meet deficits of another Vote, removed one of the incentives to economy.

They had been challenged to give practical suggestions. The practical suggestion he would make was that the power of Treasury sanction over the Votes for the Army and Navy should be limited in the same way as it was over the Civil Service Votes, in regard to which it had no power to sanction the application of money voted for one purpose to another and different purpose. There were cases in which the Treasury had to give sanction to certain expenditure which had been incurred before sanction was asked. In 1902 there was the question of the rifle range at Enfield. The War Office, on the ground of the urgency of the work, put it in hand and asked sanction. The Treasury replied that in that case they did not see sufficient justification for their not being consulted before the expenditure was incurred, but of course they gave way. Parliament had no control over the Treasury, because, after the money had been spent, they were obliged to give sanction to it. If the Government had really in their mind the idea of economy there were many practical ways of dealing with it if they chose. Laxity in the large spending Departments depended on the lavish policy of the Government, and they would continue to have all the paraphernalia of extravagance so long as there was laxity and extravagance on the Treasury Bench. Peace, retrenchment and reform were still the watchwords which the House, as the guardian of the people's treasure, should respect in fact as well as in sentiment. He heartily supported the Amendment, because he thought that there was great need indeed for peace, retrenchment and reform.

Sir CARNE RASCH (Essex, Chelmsford) said that he ventured to remark, with profound respect, in regard to the speech of the Leader of the Opposition, that economy with reference to the Army Estimates was not always the short cut to efficiency. They all knew that after the Peninsular and Crimean Wars the Estimates for the Army were cut down, and that on account of economic views then prevailing, the Army was afterwards without transport, ambulances, and almost everything that was wanted. In 1857, during the Indian Mutiny, the Army was rather better off; but when the expedition up the Nile was undertaken, Lord Wolseley had to take the cream of 100 battalions in order to get an effective force of 17,000 men. There were many other illustrations in recent history that it cost a good deal more than judicious expenditure at the right time and in the right way. If he might venture to allude to the speech of the junior Member for Oldham, he would say that that speech might as well have been read from the other side of the House; and he utterly failed to see what the hon. Member's attack on the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham had to do with the question before the House. He should like to say that if the representatives of the agricultural interest of the country had had their way, they would have liked to have had the re-imposition of the registration duty on wheat and a little something on flour which would have been a benefit to the farmers of the country. It was reported that the Emperor Charles V. of Spain had said that if he had only been consulted as to the Creation, he might have given some useful hints to the Almighty. If the agricultural interest had been consulted in regard to the corn duty they would have said that they were perfectly content to leave things as they were.

Mr. ASQUITH (Fifeshire, E.): There has been so much general agreement in the course of this debate in all quarters of the House outside the Treasury Bench as to the main proposition affirmed by the Amendment of my right hon. friend that I can assure the House that I am going to occupy only two or three minutes in pressing once more and for the last time upon the Government for a further defence of the past and a more definite assurance as to the future. Sir, the sum and substance of the debate which has taken place in the last two nights may, I think be fairly expressed, with a slight modification in language, in the classic words of a Resolution once passed by this House—"That our expenditure has increased, is increasing, and ought to be diminished." The principal facts are undisputed because they are beyond dispute and they are expressed in figures. I will only trouble the House with two or three figures which speak for themselves and are more eloquent than any comment which could be made upon them. It is conceded that during the last ten years our national expenditure—I am leaving out of account expenditure for local purposes —has increased by £50,000,000 in round numbers, or at the rate of £5,000,000 a year. It is conceded that the annual cost of the Navy and Army during that time has doubled, indeed more than doubled. It is an undoubted fact that the capital of the Debt has been added to by at least £135,000,000; and, although that, of course, was a debt incurred for abnormal expenditure, yet the burden of the interest is, until it is liquidated, a standing charge upon the annual finances of the country. And if you turn to the other aspect of the matter, as it is natural and appropriate to do in discussing a Finance Bill, and measure our expenditure by the additional taxation imposed upon the people, you will find this significant fact—that of the £33,500,000 which was put on in the shape of additional taxation either actually for the war or, at any rate, under the pressure of circumstances connected with the war, we shall in the year whose financial arrangements we are considering, still be subject to £25,500,000. In other words, the war being over, except for the permanent addition to the Debt, and the expenses of the war being completely liquidated, out of that additional taxation of £33,500,000, we have only saved some £7,000,000 or £7,500,000.

These are figures that are beyond controversy, and one naturally asks — What is the apology which is offered on the part of those who are responsible for our finance? It has taken various forms in the course of the debate. The first, and from a Parliamentary point of view, the simplest and most obvious is what we may call the *tu quoque*, which is addressed on this occasion not only to those who sit on this Bench and have been themselves responsible for the finances of the country in the past, but to private Members and to the House at large. As regards us who sit here and were most of us responsible, in a greater or lesser degree, for the finances of the country during the years 1892–95, I do not think we have any reason to fear comparison with those who succeeded us. I am not in the least degree ashamed to avow that I was a party to that expenditure, and I am perfectly prepared to justify it both in scale and proportion, as against those who came after us. What is the addition that we made during the three years that we were in office from 1892 to 1895? The average annual increase was a little over £2,000,000 a year. During the next four years—and, I think, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Bristol was entirely responsible for the finances of the country during the four years which succeeded our Administration—the annual average increase was £4,000,000 a year; and during the last five years, in which the administration of the finances has been shared by different Chancellors of the Exchequer sitting on that Bench, the annual average increase has been no less than £6,000,000 a year. So, our record being a little over £2,000,000, during the next four years—I am taking a slightly different distribution of period from that adopted by the Chancellor of the Exchequer this evening, but it is perfectly accurate—during the next four years that was multiplied by nearly two, and during the succeeding five years it amounted to £6,000,000. I do not think we have any reason to fear a comparison. The other form of *tu quoque* is a reproach addressed to the House at large. The House is supposed to be *particeps criminis* in this large expenditure. I agree that the Executive Government of the day, to whatever Party it belongs, is entitled and bound to resist improvident demands for extravagant expenditure for particular services from whatever quarter they proceed. But I have looked into the matter as to this session, at any rate, and I doubt very much whether, if all the proposed additions of expenditure suggested by private Members in any part of the House were added together they would amount to as much as the cost of a single battleship. [MINISTERIAL cries of "Oh, oh!"] I am speaking of discussions in Committee of Supply, which is the place where these suggestions are mainly made, and I ought to add the payment of Members and the lighting dues of the shipping interest. I believe that, as far as my estimate goes, if added together the amount, comparatively speaking, is relatively an insignificant sum. However that may be, it is not essential to my argument. I venture to repeat with the strongest emphasis what was said by my right hon. friend the Member for East Wolverhampton, that there is a totally different measure of responsibility as regards the private Member and the Executive Government of the day. They have to regard public expenditure as a whole. It is the right and the duty of the private Member in regard to some particular interest and claim to urge them on the Executive of the day; but no aggregation of claims of that kind can possibly justify neglect on the part of the Executive in discharging the primary function of safeguarding the finances of the country.

The second line of defence adopted by the official apologists of this increased expenditure is the growing prosperity of the country. I confess that is a line of defence with which I have considerable sympathy. We have been told so often in the past few months that the country is on the verge of ruin owing to our fiscal arrangements, that it is a relief to hear, after all, that we have this abounding reservoir of wealth out of which we can defray this unprecedented increase of expenditure. In one of the speeches made it was declared that "disaster was only kept from us by our increased trade and commerce." I accept the official assurance given to us by the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Secretary to the Treasury that we may dismiss from our minds this gloomy cloud of pessimism which has hung so heavily on our spirits. On this point of the argument, that derived from the increased prosperity of the country, I will venture to repeat what was said by the Leader of the Opposition, that you must regard not only the amount, but the distribution, of the national income and expenditure. It is easy to say, as the Chancellor of the Exchequer said in his able and interesting speech, that a man who is below the level of the income-tax, if he forswears beer, spirits, and tobacco, and confines himself to the consumption of bread and meat, and a little tea, may voluntarily escape a great deal of taxation which we commonly call indirect taxation. When we are discussing the apportionment of the burden of expenditure and taxation as between different classes of the country, you must take things as they are and men as they are. You must not take an ideal and abstract person, the man who lives an ascetic and isolated life, who shuts himself off from the common enjoyments and more or less perilous luxuries of our experience. You must deal with the human being as you find him. And if you come to analyse the burden of expenditure you will find that it presses with increasing weight on the people less able to bear it.

Mr. Asquith.

The third and the last defence suggested by the Chancellor of the Exchequer consists in asking, "Where are you going to reduce your expenditure?" Primarily that is a question for the Executive themselves. I will show very high authority for that proposition. The Chancellor of the Exchequer referred to the "doles" given from Imperial funds in aid of particular interests—agriculture and the owners of tithe rent-charge—and he asked, "When you come into office are you going to repeal them?" I will reply by a quotation from the greatest of our financial authorities. Speaking in 1869 on this very subject, Mr. Gladstone said that he knew no reason why £3,000,000 should at that time have been added to the public expenditure. "But it is one thing to put on £3,000,000, and it is quite another to take them off. By putting on £3,000,000 you create a number of offices, a number of new claims and new expectations, and you could not and ought not to destroy all these in a moment. Therefore the work of retrenchment must be a gradual work." Therefore, without discussing how far it would be possible, with regard to any specific class of expenditure, to retrench or reduce, the House must always remember that putting on is a very different to taking off. One thing is extremely easy and the other is extremely difficult. When you have created interests and expectations, a whole network of difficulties have been brought into existence. Let me give one or two illustrations. The right hon. Gentleman took the case of West Africa, and asked if we were going to diminish the grant spent in developing that part of the Empire for what we are all agreed to be a great Imperial need—the supply of an alternative field for the growth of cotton. I do not answer one way or the other. Personally, I am strongly in sympathy with the scheme, and I think it improbable that the grant would be discontinued. But you must not look to West Africa alone. Suppose you look to Somaliland. During the very time that this defence is offered, you have expended in Somaliland £2,500,000 upon an adventure which, as far as we can now judge by the admission of the Government themselves, was from first to last misconceived, mishandled, and futile.

Then, again, the right hon. Gentleman points to the Army. The Army has been a natural and proper topic in the course of this debate. It is very easy to talk generalities about the Army, and we all agree that if we have an Army it is a mere platitude to say that we want one that is sufficient in size, efficient in equipment, and economic in administration. But have we any assurance when we look back upon the history of the last five years either that we have such an Army or are likely to get such an Army from the present Government? Only three years ago the Government launched with much expenditure of Parliamentary time and with a rhetorical benediction from the Prime Minister an ambitious and expensive scheme which now they themselves admit to be unseaworthy, and which they are going to withdraw. I listened to the speech of the Secretary of State for War in introducing the Army Estimates this year. I will not say it was the foundation of his case, but a point on which he strongly insisted was that the system with which he found himself confronted and which he was about to reform was one which in many of its most vital features was unduly costly and totally inefficient. And what is the system put in its place? For many of the changes proposed I have much sympathy. But this House of Commons, asked to pass the Second Reading of this Finance Bill, has not the remotest idea of what is to be the cost of the Army. We have dummy Estimates put upon the Table and admitted by the Secretary of State to be framed upon lines which the Government have discarded; and until we have the further information which we have not yet extracted from the Government we have not the remotest idea what will be the ultimate Army account. That fact alone is sufficient to entitle us to challenge the abnormal expenditure which the House is asked to vote.

As to the Navy, here again it is possible to indulge in generalities on which everyone will agree. We all hold that the Navy is our first and may be our last line of defence, and that the maintenance of the supremacy of the sea is not only expedient but absolutely necessary for a country which is more dependent than any country in the world for its food supply upon sea-borne commodities. That necessity is still further enhanced by the fact that we possess by far the largest mercantile tonnage of all the marines in the world. I was rather relieved to hear that acknowledged by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. We had been told in authoritative quarters that our shipping was declining and that we were being rapidly overhauled by competitors and were on the verge of ruin. This is part of the invisible exports which, because they are invisible, some people treat as if they were non-existent. But, admitting that all these duties are cast upon our Navy and that they make it necessary for us to look upon that Navy as our first and most important line of defence, I should like to ask one or two questions of the Prime Minister as to what is called the two-Power standard suggested by the Estimates of this year. That standard applies, as we understand, only to battleships and does not apply to cruisers. When we had a discussion in Committee of Supply the Prime Minister told us that, apart from battleships, the two-Power standard was an elastic standard. Now, a standard that is elastic is, from the very word, not a standard at all. I think the House is entitled to know what is the standard which, apart from battleships, the Government, on the advice of its naval experts, adopts. The second question I would put to the Prime Minister is with regard to the two-nation-power—the actual number and the equipment. I should like to know something about that. What is the relative quality, the age, the tonnage, and the power? I should also, in connection with this question, like to ask how it is that, if our standard as regards battleships is only equivalent to that of the two largest

Powers of the world, our expenditure for four or five years past is as much as the combined expenditure of three combined Powers. I do not put this question with any desire that there should be an undue retrenchment—I think I am entitled to say that. I have consistently voted every year in favour of an adequate naval expenditure and I do not press this retrenchment beyond the level of safety. There is a natural and inevitable expenditure in naval matters to meet the needs of the country, and I believe it is one of the cardinal features of this House to regard that with vigilance. The burden, however, has been steadily growing during the last ten years, and during the last five years it has been growing at an accelerated and a wholly unexampled rate. I think the figures speak plainly without any addition from me. Here we are in a time of profound peace, with an expenditure of £120,000,000 raised out of the taxes. I am not dealing with other expenditure, with an income-tax at 1s. and a tea duty at 8d., which is equal to 100 per cent. In such a position I think there is a real justification for the Amendment of my right hon. friend, and the House will be failing in its duty if it does not express its lively dissatisfaction and anxiety, and Ministers will equally fail in their duty if they do not take in hand without further delay a diminution of the burdens which already press, and which must, in the course of time, press more and more heavily and more and more disastrously, not only upon the comfort of the people, but upon the resources and the very credit of the Empire itself.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): The right hon. Gentleman who has just summed up the debate in which the critics of the Government have taken part bases his charge naturally and rightly upon the undoubted and unquestioned growth of the expenditure of this country, not merely during the last few years, but over a large series of years. I am the last person to deny that the great growth of expenditure, whether it be Imperial or whether it be local—and local expenditure causes me quite as much anxiety as the other—should make every person responsible, either in the one class of expenditure or the other, carefully consider what it is that justifies such a growth, and whether or not the community is in a condition to bear it. I would point out that the malady from which we suffer is not a malady confined to this country, but, as was pointed out in the interesting speech of the hon. Member for Bermondsey, is a disease which can be detected, not in the germs, but seen in full and luxuriant growth, in every other community as well as our own. I think on the whole that the growth of British expenditure, serious as it undoubtedly is, will bear favourably a comparison with the growth of expenditure in other great European countries. But, Sir, as my reply will be limited, I need not perhaps follow the right hon. Gentleman into some parts of his speech—that part, for instance, in which he ventured on the most paradoxical assertion that this House, or the Members of this House, or large sections of the Members of this House who are now clamouring for economy and are going down to their constituents to denounce the extravagance of the Government, have not done their very best, in so far as votes in the lobby can do anything, to make the expenditure of the Government not merely great, but absolutely overwhelming. The right hon. Gentleman, I think, said that the growth of expenditure recommended by this House did not exceed the cost of a battleship. Well, I do not pretend to have a complete list of the suggestions made or the votes given by various Members either on this side or the other—for both sides are ardent devotees of expenditure so long as they are not responsible for the finances of the country—but I am informed that one hon. Gentleman on the Address recommended a process of afforestation which would have cost the modest sum of £35,000,000; that a Pension Bill has passed its Second Reading which would cost £5,000,000 a year at the smallest estimate; that the Second Reading was passed of another Bill which would cost more than £500,000 a year; that a third measure was discussed, though not passed, for the payment of election expenses which would have cost anything up to £500,000 a year; and that a proposal has been made that the whole profits of the Post Office, amounting to £4,000,000 a year, should be expended either in the improvement of the position of the Post Office *employés* or in adding increased facilities to those members of the community who desire to send or receive letters and telegrams, among which I do not count myself. Well, I think, without going further into the details of these Parliamentary excursions and alarums, if the right hon. Gentleman will add up the sums which I have sketched to the House, he will see that a battleship would be expensive indeed if it approached in cost the total to which these schemes would amount.

But there are, as I have said, two main questions which we have to ask. First, can the country bear the expenditure? secondly, is the expenditure necessary, regrettable as we all admit that it is? We all desire to diminish it. Even the Treasury Bench desire it. It may be difficult for hon. Gentlemen opposite to believe it, but if they will exercise a little faith even their scepticism may be allayed, and they may come to the conclusion that even the extravagant Gentlemen sitting on this Bench might perhaps have an easier time if they were not compelled to suggest taxes in the Budget, or to deal with the various criticisms of their expenditure, to which from time to time they are subject. Now, granting that the expenditure ought to be diminished, is it nevertheless of an amount which the country is incapable of bearing? Are we to be as pessimistic as the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Monmouth was in the most interesting and able speech which he delivered this afternoon—a speech which delighted us all? Are we to take his gloomy estimate of the finances? Well, I confess that even from the right hon. Gentleman's own speech I should be disposed to draw a contrary conclusion. To begin with, he compared, naturally, the extravagance of the present day with the economic theory with which Mr. Gladstone ruled the finance of this country. He looked back to the halcyon period of the early sixties. Well, but I believe that if he will work out the sum he will find that the expenditure of the country now in proportion to the wealth of the country now is smaller than the expenditure of the country in 1864 compared with the wealth of the country in 1864. So far from having gone down hill in this matter, we have improved. [HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!] I am amused. I gather from the unexpected approval that my observations appear to have met with from various quarters of the House that hon. Members were more intent on extracting admissions for their own fiscal doctrines than following the argument which I was endeavouring to address to the House. Considering that I am an advocate of free trade I do not see why they should do so. Any gentleman who has taken the trouble to study my opinions may find them very clearly expressed. But to take them on their own ground, I would point out that, if their sole test of the merits of their particular doctrine is that this country has grown in wealth under free trade, they would be greatly embarrassed by a similar argument if applied to other countries which have not free trade. I think myself the argument on either side is a very childish one. If you are to decide whether a particular fiscal system is good or bad because the country which enjoys it has increased in population and wealth, you will make a very small advance in any knowledge of political economy. If the House will allow me to revert to what is the proper point of the argument I am addressing to it, let me repeat that if the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Monmouth is of opinion that we are now staggering fatally under the burden of taxation, I can only say that the burden of taxation, relative to our powers of bearing it, is now lighter than it was forty years ago.

Then the right hon. Gentleman said the State Debt is appalling, that public credit is shaken to its foundations. But the Public Debt, as he told us himself, is now at the point it was somewhere in the seventies, I think. Yes, 1874 was his date, just at the end of Mr. Gladstone's first Administration. The amount of the Debt now is exactly what it was at the end of Mr. Gladstone's Administration. I quite agree that, considering what efforts we have made to pay it off, it is greatly to be regretted that the great war in South Africa and the increased expenditure have brought it up to its present limits; but to say that the Debt is too much for us now, with all the growth of wealth I have described, when we bore it without sinking under the burden in 1874, is surely an absurdity. If you turn your attention from the capital charge of the Debt to the interest of the Debt, the comparison is equally against the right hon. Gentleman; because he told us himself in the course of his speech that the interest of the Debt now was at the same figure as it was towards the end of Mr. Gladstone's second Government in 1884. Under those circumstances, deeply as we may deplore that the Debt has increased, yet, in view of the fact that with a smaller population and smaller wealth that Debt was borne, I will not say lightly or with ease, but without distress and anything in the nature of destruction of credit—in view of that fact, we need not think the burden of debt is going to distress us.

Then comes the more difficult question whether the burden is a necessary burden. I will deal briefly with the points raised by the right hon. Gentleman opposite in the speech he has just made. He said that my right hon. friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer had informed the House that one of the great burdens of the Exchequer consisted now of contributions to local taxation, among which contributions were certain contributions which were bitterly, even obstructively, fought by hon. Gentlemen opposite not many years ago. Then the question arises, does the right hon. Gentleman intend to repeal that burden on the Exchequer when he comes into office? And here I saw the first dawning of financial responsibility which has illumined the Front Opposition Bench through all these debates. The right hon. Gentleman discovered a reason apparently, or thinks he discovered a reason, for obtaining contributions to local taxation when he is in office which he bitterly attacked when he was out of office. He said, You create all sorts of subsidiary interests, all sorts of *employés*—I do not know what the interests were that were created. But I do know this, that if there was the smallest sincerity in the opposition offered to the Tithe Rent Charge Bill, or the Bill for the Relief of Agricultural Rates, there would not be the slightest difficulty in any Government which comes in, and thinks those measures were wrong, repealing them. I will not discuss Somaliland. Hon. Gentlemen by their cheers seem to think it is because I am afraid of the topic; I am not afraid of that or any other topic; and if they will insist on my referring to it, I will refer to it. And I say this, that much as we regret the necessity we have been under of expending money and valuable lives in Somaliland, let no Government which may come into office in this country, whose responsibilities extend to every quarter of the globe and to every continent, think they will be able to avoid expenditure of that kind. Hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite have been the greatest sinners in that, if sin there be. But in truth these are the unhappy burdens and responsibilities of an Empire such as ours; and you will no more be able to escape them in office by making fine speeches when in Opposition than you will be able to avoid any of the laws of nature by which, regret it as we may, we are inevitably bound.

The right hon. Gentleman discussed the Army policy of the Government. Does he intend me to go through that before I sit down? The right hon. Gentleman said we were now proposing to change the Army system, a system which in our hands had no doubt proved very costly, and which we thought was not suited to the existing conditions of the Empire. Is that a subject of criticism? It cannot be the subject of criticism. It is perfectly true the Government have been considering, and I hope shortly will be able to give to the House their views on Army reconstitution. But the Army system which exists now is a system which we did not create, which has been systematically defended by the right hon. Gentleman opposite, which we have done our best to bring up to the needs and requirements of the country, and which, I will say it boldly, under the most able direction of the present Secretary of State for India and his predecessor was turned into a fighting machine such as never has been known before in the history of the nation. That system, even perfected as it has been by those eminent administrators—[OPPOSITION laughter]—Gentlemen who laugh know nothing about the subject—even perfected as it has been by those eminent administrators, is one which, we think, does require change. Who is responsible for the system? Why, Sir, it has been the proudest boast of hon. Gentlemen opposite that they are its authors, and, indeed, I believe their solitary claim to constructive Army reform was the establishment of the very system which we now propose to alter. Then, Sir, the right hon. Gentleman went on to ask me certain questions about the Fleet, and he asked me what our standard was with regard to cruisers. He twitted me, rather unnecessarily I think, with having described it as an elastic standard. It is incapable of the semi-mathematical accuracy of what is called the two-Power standard of battleships. The cruisers have got very different and much less definable duties to perform. It is necessary, in the first place, to provide a sufficient number of cruisers to form the proper complement to the fighting Fleet, and, in the second place, to provide the number of cruisers necessary to patrol the waters through which British commerce flows. It is impossible to lay down a standard for the second of these requirements, nor can any parallel be drawn between the marine policing which is incumbent on this country, and the marine policing which is incumbent on any other country; and that being so, whatever standard we might lay down is not to be found in a comparison of the number of our cruisers with the number of cruisers used by other Powers, but in a comparison of the number of our cruisers with the work those cruisers have to perform. The right hon. Gentleman has asked me further questions to which I could not now give him any conclusive or accurate answers, but I would point out that there are many reasons which must make a navy which is used as our Navy is used more costly than those of other countries. Take the case of Germany, for instance; she keeps her fleet in two ports, her ships are constructed to fight close at home, she does not contemplate oversea responsibilities of any great or important character, and she does not depend on the voluntary system of enlistment which we necessarily depend upon. You cannot have fleets of that character with objects so different, and expect them to be worked at a like cost. That, I think, will do something to satisfy the right hon. Gentleman's third question.

But there is a deeper question underlying all this question of expenditure on the Navy and Army, and on the Army in particular. The right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition made a great many very sarcastic references to the Defence Committee and to myself, as head of that Committee. I need not tell the right hon. Gentleman that I am sure he meant nothing personally offensive to myself, and I go much further and say I do not object to anybody making criticisms of that kind. I have never put any service that I have been able to perform on the Defence Committee at any high level at all. I can conscientiously say that I have never pretended that I have done much — well, I have hoped to do much — but I never raised any undue expectations of my own performances in this connection during such time as I may remain president of that Committee. But not a meeting of that Committee passes — and we meet weekly — without impressing more and more deeply upon me my sense of its absolute necessity, and of the incalculable loss this country has suffered from not having had such a Committee at work for many years past. Our work is necessarily slow. The president of the Committee, as the House may very well conceive, is a very hard-worked man, a man who has got to keep in his mind an immense variety of subjects; and results, therefore, may not be arrived at with all the rapidity we had hoped and which the public have had a right to expect. But we are making progress, progress of the most valuable kind; and I frankly tell the House that, while the conclusions at which we have arrived with regard to Home Defence are undoubtedly reassuring as regards the number and cost of troops required to keep inviolate these shores from the only kind of invasion to which we believe them to be susceptible, it is brought home to me more and more every day that we have become by the mere inevitable march of events a Continental Power with borders coterminous with one of the greatest military empires of the world, or, if not coterminous, in the near neighbourhood of one of the greatest military Powers of the world. We have been told that if we only come to a friendly arrangement with that Power no force need be provided for the defence of our Indian Empire—well, at all events, that we may diminish the force otherwise necessary for the defence of the Indian Empire. Is that a policy adopted by any other country in the world, whatever be its relations with its near neighbour? There are countries on the Continent—I do not specify, it would be absurd to name names—but there are countries on the Continent in the closest friendship and alliance with their neighbours, who, nevertheless, put every man they can under arms, and would feel if they altered that policy, however close the ties of treaty might be with their neighbours, that they would practically be handing themselves over to any change of public opinion in either country to be coerced and possibly defeated by their whilom friends. You can improvise much, but there is much in an army you cannot improvise; and, believe me, it would be perfect madness for this country to put itself, whatever its agreements were—and I hope our feelings towards our neighbours in Asia are of the friendliest description—it would be madness for us to lay down the proposition that, because we were able to come to a friendly understanding in regard to pending questions between us, therefore we were not to have all the preparations at our command which could not be invented on the spur of the moment. We must have preparation if our defence is to be effective and if we hope that defence will stand the strain and test of time. No other nation does that. Do not let us imitate a folly which has been committed by no other nation. [An Irish Member: A four-leaved shamrock!] I am glad I carry part of the House with me. In deference to the more stolid majority, let me correct my statement and say, do not let us perpetrate a folly which has been committed by no other nation. The House may depend upon it that this question of the needs of Empire and of the cost of Empire is one which is continually engaging and preoccupying the attention of His Majesty's Government. It is not a question we are allowing to sleep. It is not a question which we feel can be hastily settled. But it is, perhaps, of all the questions pressing upon our attention the one which is most closely engaging us; and if it be possible, and I hope it will be possible, to diminish the cost of these defensive armaments, let it at all events be done in conformity with a reasonable and rational plan, and not in obedience to some quite unjustified panic about the strength of the taxpayers of this country to bear the burdens which we have reluctantly put on, which we would gladly take off, and which we are convinced they will equally gladly bear if we are able to show that it is only at that price that the Empire can be adequately and honourably sustained.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 297; Noes, 213. (Division List No. 125.)

AYES.

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, Augustus Hen. Eden
Allsopp, Hon. George
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt.Hn HughO
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, RtHn. Sir H
Bagot, Capt. JoscelineFitzRoy
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt.Hn. A. J.(Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt.Hon. G. W.(Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barry, SirFrancisT. (Windsor)
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles

Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Boulnois, Edmund
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, Lt.-ColH.F(Middlesex
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Campbell, J.H.M(DublinUniv.
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt.Hn. J.(Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt HnJ.A(Worc.
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Rt. Hon. Sir John C.R
Colston, Chas. Edw. H.Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cox,Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Craig,Charles Curtis (Antrim,S.
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Davies,Sir H. D. (Chatham)
Denny, Colonel
Dewar, SirTR(Tower Hamlets
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt.Hn.Sir Joseph C.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir F. Dixon
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Duke, Henry Edward
Dyke, Rt.Hn.Sir William Hart
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants,W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fergusson,RtHn Sir J(Manc'r.
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald Sir Robert Penrose
Fitzroy, Hon.Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Forster, Henry William
Foster, P. S. (Warwick, S.W.
Fyler, John Arthur
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gordon,Hn J.E(Elgin &Nairn
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Gordon,Maj Evans-(T'rH'mlets
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Green,Walford D(Wednesbury
Greene,Sir E.W(B'rySEdm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Hain, Edward
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton,RtHnLord G(Midd'x
Hamilton,Marq of(L'nd'nderry
Hardy, L. (Kent, Ashford)
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th
Harris, Dr. Fredk. R. (Dulwich
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, James (Staffords., N.W.
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford,W.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse,RtHnH(Somers't, E
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J.F(Sheffield, Brightside
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, J. (Kent, Faversham)
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Hozier,Hon.James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Hutton, John (Yorks. N.R.)
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Kennaway,Rt.Hn.Sir John H.
Kenyon, Hon.Geo.T. (Denbigh
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W.(Salop.
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
Knowles, Sir Lees
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence,Sir Joseph(Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, J. Grant (Yorks. N.R.
Lee, A, H. (Hants., Fareham)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower,Frederick N.S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long,Col.Charles W.(Evesham
Long,Rt Hn Walter(Bristol,S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Calmont, Colonel James
M'Iver, Sir L. (Edinburgh, W.)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W.F.
Maxwell,Rt.Hn.SirH.E.(Wigt'n
Maxwell, W.J.H(Dumfries-sh.
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Middlemore, Jn. Throgmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt.Hn.Sir Frederick G.
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants
Moore, William
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray,RtHn A.Graham(Bute
Murray, Charles J. Coventry)
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Herb. Pike (Darlington)
Peel, HnWm.Robert Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Pym, C. Guy
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, Hn. M. W.(Stalybridge
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas.Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)

Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Sir H. S. (Limehouse)
Sandys, Lt.-Col. Thos. Myles
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Saunderson, RtHn.Col.Edw. J.
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, Sir H.(Renfrew
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford,East
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley,Edward Jas.(Somerset
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.
Stewart,Sir Mark J.M'Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt.Hn.J.G(Oxf'dUniv.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond,Rt.Hn.Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby,Lt.-Col.A.C.E(Taunton
Welby,Sir Charles G. E(Notts.)
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon-
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H.(Ashton-und.Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W.H. (Yorks.
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R(Bath
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt.Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ambrose, Robert
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Beckett, Ernest William
Bell, Richard
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Brigg, John
Brown, George M.(Edinburgh)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carvill, Patrick Geo.Hamilton
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clancy, John Joseph
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Cullinan, J.
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan)
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas.Ramsay (Galway)
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobbie, Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellice, Cpt.E.C(SAndrw'sBghs.
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Sir FrancisH(Maidstone
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Field, William
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt.Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harcourt,Lewis V. (Rossendale
Harcourt,RtHn SirW(Monm'th
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson, E.
Kilbride, Denis
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leamy, Edmund
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Crae, George
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mellor, Rt. Hon. John William
Mitchell, Edw. (Fermanagh,N.

Mooney, John J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Morley, Rt. Hn. John (Montrose
Moss, Samuel
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Newnes, Sir George
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid.)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon N,
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Palmer, Sir Chas. M. (Durham)
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Slack, John (Bamford)
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn. C. R (Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Thoedore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Wallace, Robert
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S·
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Fred W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse, Sir J T (Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. William M'Arthur

Main Question again proposed.

Motion made and Question, "That the debate be now adjourned"—(*Mr. Clancy*,)—put, and agreed to.

Debate to be resumed to-morrow.

THE FREE FOOD MOTION.

MR. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs) asked the Prime Minister if he could give the House the terms of the Amendment which he proposed to move to the Resolution standing on the Paper for to-morrow night.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I cannot do so at this moment. The Amendment will be handed in at the Table.

MR DALZIEL: Before the House adjourns?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Yes.

NAVAL WORKS (PORTSMOUTH BARRACKS SITE) BILL.

Ordered, That the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills do examine the Naval Works (Portsmouth Barracks Site) Bill, with respect to compliance with the Standing Orders relative to Private Bills.—(*Mr. Pretyman.*)

Ajourned at a quarter after Twelve o'clock.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 18th May, 1904.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Chesterfield Corporation (Tramways and Improvements) Bill [Lords]; Liverpool and London and Globe Insurance Company Bill [Lords]; University of Leeds Bill [Lords]; Yorktown and Blackwater Gas Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2). Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade, under The General Pier and Harbour Act, 1861, relating to Hartlepool, Islay, and Waterford, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Gerald Balfour and Mr. Bonar Law.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill. "To confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade, under The General Pier and Harbour Act, 1861, relating to Hartlepool, Islay, and Waterford," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills and to be printed. [Bill 208.]

Middlesborough, Stockton-on-Tees, and Thornaby Tramways Bill. Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

RAILWAY BILLS (GROUP No. 8).

Mr. **Henry Hobhouse** reported from the Committee on Group No. 8 of Railway Bills; That Mr. Crean, one of the Members of the said Committee, was not present during the Sitting of the Committee on Monday last.

Report to lie upon the Table.

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions for alteration; from Perth; and Brechin and Fordoun; to lie upon the Table.

HOME INDUSTRIES BILL.

Petition from Glasgow, against; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions against; from Dreghorn; Leeds (three); Dumfermline; Preston; Ilkley; Leicester (five); Glasgow (three); Great Harwood; Leicestershire (two); Earlestown; Broughty Ferry (two); Buckie (two); Nuneaton; Evesham; Skelmanthorpe; Muswell Hill; Edinburgh (five); Saint Neots; Bolton; Clevedon; Manchester; Royston; Darton; Bury St. Edmunds; Liverpool (three); Par; Aspatria and Brayton; Gilsland; Jordan; Looe; Altrincham (two); Montrose; Walkden; Grays; Tindale; Reading; Broadheath; Lockerley; Wigan; Coalville; Brookfield; West Gorton; Tibshelf; Berwick; Dalwhinnie; Southwark; Biggar; Bellfield; Fulham; Beith; Taunton (three); Boston; Stirchley; Gillingham; Tarbert; Bacup; Exeter; National Union for the Suppression of Intemperance; Cleckheaton; Swinton; North Devon; Haslemere; Sale and Ashton on Mersey; Ibstock; Salford; Bowmore; Maryhill; Vale of Clyde; Beaufort; Oldham; Maryhill; Newbridge; Tredavoe Paul; Brierley Hill; Darvel; Wakefield (four); Peebles; Weston-super-Mare (twenty); Ackworth (three); Buccleugh; Cardiff; Nottingham (two); Bulwell; Pontypridd; Llangerriew; Birkenhead; Wrexham; Bervie; Irwell Bank; Atherstone; Dunfermline; Heywood (two); Sunningdale; Brechin and Fordoun; Hull; Llandilo (two); Burry Port; Ossett (two) New Herrington; Lewes; National United Temperance Council; Hedon; Hornsea; East Dereham; Inverleithen; Broughton; Plymouth (three); Armley; Manor Park; Forest Gate; Islington (two); Long Sutton; Street; Walton; Banff and West Aberdeen; Stockport; Heaton Norris; Wellow; Borough Market; Torquay (two); Thurlby; Devonport and Stonehouse; Keyham; Stonehouse; Devonport; Waterbeach; Cottenham; Buxton; St. Ives; Down; Rawtenstall; Eaglesfield; Lochgelly; Coaltown of Wemyss; Methil; Aberdeen (two); Lanark; Cheshire; Little Leigh; Kensington (Brecon); Breconshire; Northwich (two); Dundee (six); Great Grimsby (three); Bristol (two); Huncote; Great Wigston; Coatbridge; Portsmouth; Blaina; Old Buckenham; Kelty; Wymondham; Newtown; Shotts; Gloucester (two); Audlem; Greenbank; Aber; Ayrshire; Bradford (two); Greyton; Nitshill; Croydon (two); New Hirst; Backworth; South

Aberdeen; Aspull; Spencer's Wood; New Clee and Weelsby; and Long Eaton; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL

Petition from Hurlford, for extension of provisions to Scotland; to lie upon the Table.

RE-VACCINATION BILL.

Petition from Great Yarmouth, against; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF BUTTER BILL.

Petition from Glasgow, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION BILL.

Petition from Bristol, against; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

HARBOURS OF REFUGE.

Copy presented, of Memorandum by Commander S. C. Frederick, R.N., on the question of constructing a Harbour of Refuge on the north coast of Cornwall [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

SUPERANNUATION ACT, 1884.

Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 14th May, 1904, declaring that Henry Floodgate Taffs, Principal Foreman Writer, Woolwich Arsenal, War Department, was appointed without a Civil Service certificate, through inadvertence on the part of the Head of his Department [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

CHINA (No. 3, 1904).

Copy presented, of Despatch from His Majesty's Minister at Peking, inclosing a Report by Mr. George J. Kidston on a journey in Mongolia [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

AFRICA (No. 6, 1904).

Copy presented, of Convention between the United Kingdom and China respecting the Employment of Chinese Labour in British Colonies and Protectorates. Signed at London, 13th May, 1904 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (MISCELLANEOUS SERIES).

Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Miscellaneous Series, No. 609 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3164 to 3167 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PUBLIC INCOME AND EXPENDITURE.

Return ordered, "of Net Public Income and Net Public Expenditure under certain specified heads, as represented by Receipts into and Issues out of the Exchequer from 1889–90 to 1903–4, inclusive (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 272, of Session 1903)."—(*Sir Henry Fowler.*)

MEDICAL OFFICERS OF HEALTH FOR COUNTIES.

Return ordered, "showing the names of the County Councils in England and Wales who have Medical Officers of Health, with the terms of the appointments (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 202, of Session 1896)."—(*Mr. Frederick Wilson.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Army Recruiting.

SIR JOHN COLOMB (Great Yarmouth): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can state the results of the general application of enlistment for three-years recruits recently established; what is the percentage of re-engagements required in the several arms of the service to fulfil the requirements of the Army abroad; and what percentage of men in the several arms have re-engaged.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) As regards recruiting it is difficult to estimate the effect of the three years system of enlistment as it was initiated during the South African war, and as subsequently recruiting has been closed for several branches of the service, but, generally speaking, recruiting may be said to show steady progress. As regards extensions the percentage required is calculated to be as follows:—

Infantry of the Line . . .	71·68
Cavalry	41·90
Horse and Field Artillery . .	31·23
Garrison and Mountain Artillery	100

The figures showing the actual extensions are not complete, as the returns from abroad have not yet been received, but percentages at home of those eligible to draw service pay on 1st April and 1st May who extended to the whole number so eligible were as follows:—

	April.	May.
Infantry of the Line .	13·4	12·17
Cavalry	28·5	5·64
Horse and Field Artillery	49·5	29·58
Garrison Artillery . .	48·6	33·76

Normal Military Expenditure of France, Germany, and Russia.

MR. RUNCIMAN (Dewsbury): To ask the Secretary of State for War if he can state what has been the total military expenditure out of revenue or out of capital, apart from special war expenditure, of France, Germany, and Russia respectively in each year for the past twenty-five years.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) It is impossible to fix the actual military expenditure in all cases, as in some instances it has not been published. Moreover, in some cases the Naval Budgets make provision for certain items, such as coast fortifications, which are of a military nature. Again, expenditure regarding pensions is not shown in some of the Military Budgets. The following table gives the information available, but its accuracy cannot be guaranteed:—

	I.—France (Amount Voted in Military Budget).	II.—Germany (Expenditure as shown in Military Budget).	III.—Russia (Expenditure as shown in Military Budget).
	£	£	£
1880	29,396,364	18,505,000	21,074,000
1881	27,102,940	19,805,000	22,968,000 *
1882	26,223,788	18,533,000	20,388,000
1883	26,738,336	18,217,000	21,454,000
1884	28,242,730	18,385,000	22,425,000
1885	27,252,248	18,583,000	23,221,000
1886	25,625,128	19,804,000	23,543,000
1887	26,573,540	28,765,000	23,439,000
1888	24,565,993	36,265,000	23,566,000
1889	27,567,269	27,065,000	25,101,000
1890	28,416,262	35,975,000	25,346,000
1891	27,029,161	28,375,000	25,123,000
1892	25,830,177	28,831,000	26,231,000
1893	25,384,405	30,128,000	26,257,000
1894	25,346,123	30,888,000	30,742,000
1895	25,510,992	27,526,000	31,259,000
1896	22,978,214	28,292,000	32,040,000
1897	24,902,055	29,549,000	32,076,000
1898	24,906,056	30,405,000	33,162,000
1899	25,287,220	32,236,000	36,483,000
1900	25,767,340	33,427,000 ‡	36,838,000
1901	27,774,581	34,005,000 ‡	36,067,000
1902	28,664,000	32,686,000 ‡	35,849,000
1903	27,593,478	31,880,000 ‡	36,647,000 ‡
1904	27,053,196	31,883,000 ‡	40,086,000 ‡

* Includes expenditure (sum not known) on Skobeleff's Central Asia Campaign.

† Between 1896–1899 an expenditure of £6,400,000 was incurred as part of the cost of the re-arming of the Field Artillery which is not included in the above figures.

The figures given in columns I. and II. are exclusive of sums voted for troops in the Colonies. These cannot be given. Figures marked ‡ in columns II. and III. refer to estimated, not actual, expenditure.

Sentence of Banishment on a Frenchwoman in Jersey.

Mr. BAYLEY (Derbyshire, Chesterfield): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to a case which occurred in the Royal Court of Jersey on Saturday, 7th May, in which a woman of French nationality was sentenced to five years banishment, but, being wanted as a witness in a pending case in England, was ordered to be sent to England instead of to France, Sir W. H. V. Vernon stating that she would be sent to France *viâ* England; and, if so, will he say what means exist of forcing her to leave England for France, and whether the attention of the authorities of Jersey will be called to the effect of such a sentence of banishment.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) I have been in communication with the Bailiff of Jersey in regard to this case and am informed that the Court in sentencing her to banishment from Jersey for five years, ordered that steps should be taken for her repatriation *viâ* England. There are no means of forcing her to leave England, but it is understood that she is quite willing, in due course, to return hence to her own country. The authorities of Jersey are well aware, without further intervention on my part, of the effect of the sentence.

Hearing of Juvenile Cases at Police Courts.

Mr TALBOT (Oxford University): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland has made arrangements in Dublin whereby one of the divisional magistrates will dispose of cases in which juveniles are concerned in a room at the Police Courts, known as the Central Hall, and that the children, whilst waiting for their cases to come on, will be kept apart in a disused room, and in Cork, whereby the magistrates will hold a special Court for the hearing of children's cases on a particular day, or at a particular hour, when young persons and their parents would alone be present; and whether he will consider the possibility of making similar arrangements in London and other large cities.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) The arrangements for the hearing of charges by Courts of summary jurisdiction are not within my control, except in so far as the Metropolitan Police Courts are concerned, and at these Courts the separation of juvenile offenders from others has been the subject of much anxious thought and consideration by the magistrates and the police. Cases in which juveniles are charged are taken first on the list of cases for hearing; and in other ways, both before and after the hearing of a charge, every care is taken to keep children apart from adult offenders. Outside London the matter is one for the local authorities, but I have no reason to doubt that they are alive to its importance.

Female Learner in North Shields Post Office.

Mr. ROBSON (South Shields): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that a female learner has been employed at the North Shields Post Office on telegraph delivery duties since the 20th February, 1903, without any salary whatever; and, if so, will he say whether this is in accordance with the service regulations; and whether he will investigate the circumstances with a view to giving the learner a salary or an appointment.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) There is one female learner at North Shields who is not on the "paid" establishment and who has been in the office since 27th October, 1902; but she has not been without pay all the time, as for forty-nine weeks she has been employed as substitute for other officers, and has received pay varying from 5s. to 10s. a week while so employed. During part of this time it was her duty to place telegrams in envelopes and address them; but she has never been employed in delivering telegrams. How soon this learner may obtain a paid learnership or an established appointment will necessarily depend on the occurrence of a vacancy, and I am unable to give an approximate date.

Delay in Completion of Telegraph Connection between Mountrath and Coolrain.

Mr. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he can explain the delay which has taken place in the completion of the telegraph connection between Mountrath, Queen's County, and Coolrain, in view of the fact that the required guarantee was given and the agreement completed with the Post Office authorities last June.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) The telegraph extension to Coolrain could not be carried out in last financial year for lack of funds. It is now in hand and will, I hope, be very soon completed.

Post Office and Private Telephone Lines.

MR. RIGG (Westmoreland, Appleby): To ask the Postmaster-General whether, in view of the fact that the Department has entered into certain contracts for private telephone lines between London and provincial centres, he will explain why, in response to inquiries by other firms for similar facilities, the Department has replied that it is not in a position to quote rates or enter into fresh similar contracts; and whether he will take steps to secure that a preference in the nature of a monopoly is not thus created.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) During the last two years it has been necessary to refuse to provide long telephone lines between London and places such as Manchester, Liverpool, and Glasgow, for private use, owing to the difficulty of finding space on existing routes even for the new wires required for the public service. Estimates of the cost of constructing new routes for additional wires have been prepared, and I am considering whether it will be possible to supply long private telephone lines to all applicants for them.

Average Price and Consumption of Meat in the United Kingdom.

MR. ALFRED DAVIES (Carmarthen Boroughs): To ask the President of the Local Government Board if he will state the consumption of meat per head of the population in the United Kingdom, and average price paid during each of the five years previous to the repeal of the Corn Laws, and during each of the last five years.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) There are no means of giving the information asked for with regard to the consumption of meat per head of the population of the United Kingdom in the years named. Some information as to the present rate of consumption of meat by working-class families will be found on pp. 210–12 of Cd. 1761 of 1903. The average price of live meat (beef) at the Metropolitan Cattle Market per stone of 8lbs. (sinking the offal) in the years named in the Question, was as follows:—

	Fourth Class.	Third Class.	Second Class.	Inferior.
	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.
1841	4 7½	4 2¼	3 9	3 4½
1842	4 5¼	3 11¼	3 7	3 4¼
1843	3 10¼	3 7	3 2½	2 8¾
1844	3 10¾	3 5¾	3 1	2 7¼
1845	4 1¼	3 9	3 5¼	2 9¾

	First Quality.	Second Quality.	Inferior Quality.
	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.
1899	4 7	3 11	2 6
1900	4 10	4 2	3 1
1901	4 7	3 11	2 4
1902	4 11	4 4	2 11
1903	4 8	4 1	2 10

The average import value of fresh beef in each of the last five years per 8lbs. was—

	s. d.
1899 . . .	2 9
1900 . . .	2 10
1901 . . .	2 9¾
1902 . . .	3 0½
1903 . . .	2 10½

The average price of live meat (mutton) at the Metropolitan Cattle Market per stone of 8lbs. (sinking the offal) was as follows—

	Fourth Class.	Third Class.	Second Class.	Inferior.
	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.
1841	4 11	4 4½	3 10¼	3 6½
1842	4 5¾	4 1½	3 10	3 5½
1843	4 1	3 10	3 5	3 0½
1844	4 0½	3 8¼	3 5¾	2 11
1845	4 9	4 3¾	3 10¼	3 4¼

	First Quality.	Second Quality.	Inferior Quality.
	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.
1899	5 8	5 0	3 4
1900	6 0	5 3	3 4
1901	5 8	4 10	3 3
1902	5 9	5 0	3 7
1903	5 10	5 1	3 8

The average import value of fresh mutton in each of the last five years per 8lb. was—

	s. d.
1899 . . .	2 3
1900 . . .	2 5½
1901 . . .	2 7¼
1902 . . .	2 8½
1903 . . .	2 9½

Education (Scotland) Fund.

SIR HERBERT MAXWELL (Wigtonshire): To ask the Secretary for Scotland whether he can state approximately what the charge on the Education (Scotland) Fund, provided for under Clause 38 of the Education (Scotland) Bill, will amount to under Sub-section (3) (E) and (F), of Clause 39 respectively.

(*Answered by Mr. A. Graham Murray.*) The approximate estimate of the amount which would be payable under Sub-section 3 (E) of Clause 39 is £145,000. It is obviously impossible to give even an approximate estimate of the amount under Sub-section 3 (F).

SIR CHARLES RENSHAW (Renfrewshire, W.): To ask the Secretary for Scotland whether he can state approximately what the balance of the Education (Scotland) Fund will amount to per head of the average attendance of scholars in schools under School Boards and under managers.

(*Answered by Mr. A. Graham Murray.*) As the balance under Sub-section 4 of Clause 39 of the Bill depends upon the amount required for eight preceding claims upon the grant, I must decline to commit myself to any estimate of the amount available per head of the average attendance.

Normal Naval Expenditure of France, Germany, and Russia.

MR. RUNCIMAN: To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he will obtain the information necessary to enable him to state what has been the total naval expenditure out of revenue or out of capital, apart from special war expenditure, of France, Germany, and Russia, respectively, for each of the past twenty-five years.

(*Answered by Mr. Pretyman.*) I regret that I am unable to meet the hon. Member's wishes, but the Admiralty cannot undertake this inquiry.

Rocket and Line Apparatus on Ships of War.

MR. MASSEY-MAINWARING (Finsbury, Central): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether, in view of the fact that a collision occurred on the Tyne in April between H.M.S. "Immortalité" and H.M.S. "Temeraire" causing serious damage to the former which could have been prevented if both ships had been fitted with a rocket and line apparatus, he will consider the advisability of arranging that all His Majesty's ships should be supplied with a rocket and line apparatus of the most improved kind.

(*Answered by Mr. Pretyman.*) The collision occurred through a misunderstanding on the part of the officers in command of the "Immortalité" and "Temeraire" and not through want of a rocket and line apparatus. It is not considered necessary to supply the apparatus to His Majesty's ships.

Rocket and Line Apparatus on Merchant Ships.

MR. MASSEY-MAINWARING: To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that at the International Conference at Nantes a resolution was passed recommending that all vessels should carry a rocket and line apparatus to enable them to make communication with the shore when in danger of being wrecked; and whether he will order all shipowners to carry such an apparatus on their vessels.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) I am aware that a Congress was held at Nantes in 1902 to consider among other matters life-saving at sea. No representative of the Board of Trade or of the British Government attended its meetings, and the resolutions passed have not come under my notice. The suggestion referred to by my hon. friend in his Question has from time to time been considered by the Board of Trade, but practical difficulties would arise in giving effect to it. Rules for life-saving appliances have been made under Section 427 of The Merchant Shipping Act, 1894, and were revised two years ago; the requirements of these rules are considered adequate. A rocket apparatus exists at various points round the coast of the United Kingdom, and does useful work in enabling communication to be made with ships in distress. It is, of course, open to shipowners to put a rocket and line apparatus on board ship; I do not at present propose to take any action with a view to compelling them to do so.

Fitzgerald Estate, Furlough, County Mayo.

DR. AMBROSE (Mayo, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that large grazing farms situated in the Fitzgerald Estate, Furlough, county Mayo, have been sold by private treaty to graziers named Beckett; and that there are several congested areas in the neighbourhood of this estate the holdings on which range from two to six acres; and, if so, will he see that the grazing tracts in this estate are sold for the benefit of those tenants.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) I have referred this Question to the Congested Districts Board who will make inquiry in the matter.

Second-Term Rents—Case of Mr. H. Halpin of Whitestown.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can explain why the Land Commission, in the case of Mr. Hugh Halpin, Whitestown, Stratford-on-Slaney, county Wicklow, fixed his second-term rent to commence on 29th September, 1902, instead of on 25th March, 1902, in view of the fact that his first-term rent commenced on 25th March, 1887, and that he served an originating notice before 25th March, 1902, to have a second-term rent fixed; that the Sub-Commission heard the case at Baltinglass on 3rd November, 1903, and the order fixing the second-term rent was made on 11th January, 1904, the said order fixing the second-term rent to commence on 29th September, 1902, instead of 25th March, whereby the tenant loses the reduction on a half-year's rent.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) Mr. Halpin served his application to have a rent fixed for a first statutory term on 28th September, 1887. The first statutory term accordingly commenced to run from 29th September, 1887, pursuant to the provisions of Section 5 of The Land Act, 1887. Application was made to fix a fair rent for second statutory term on 25th September, 1902, and in accordance with the provisions of Section 3, Sub-section 2, of The Land Act, 1896, the second statutory term commenced from 29th September, 1902, as stated in the order fixing the fair rent.

Uniform of Infantry Sergeants.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): To ask the Secretary of State for War, seeing that a recent Army order provides for a trimming of gold lace on the new service cap of sergeants of artillery, cavalry, and departmental corps, if he can say why the same privilege has not been extended to sergeants of infantry battalions, who possess the plainest pattern of this cap; and whether, seeing that the caps issued to the former corps have already a decoration of coloured braid, he can say when it is proposed to give sergeants of infantry battalions a uniform suitable to their rank, as is done in all other branches of the Army.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) The cap worn by sergeants of cavalry, artillery, engineers, and departmental corps has always been different from that of the rank and file; that worn by infantry sergeants has always been of the same pattern as that of the rank and file; while in the case of the infantry the sergeant is distinguished by the sash, which is special to his branch of the service. There does not, therefore, appear to be any good grounds for carrying out the suggested alteration, which would involve a very heavy expenditure of public money.

Health of 1st Hampshire Regiment—Detention at Aden.

MR. JOHN HUTTON (Yorkshire, Richmond): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can state what has lately been the condition with regard to health of the 1st Battalion Hampshire Regiment at Aden; whether he is aware that many men have died of fever and that on one occasion only one officer was fit for duty; whether the battalion has been detained at Aden beyond its time for want of a transport; and, if so, whether he will explain the reasons why a transport has not sooner been found to bring them home

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) There has been considerable sickness from malaria in this battalion due to service in the Aden Hinterland, and the latest returns of sickness at Aden, those for March, show ninety-nine admissions and one death; this is the only death so reported during 1904. Of the officers five were sick out of nine in March. The battalion was primarily detained for military exigencies in the Aden Hinterland, and subsequently the accident to the "Assaye" caused further delay; this ship will bring the battalion home.

Mess Tents for Militia Regiments.

MR. RUNCIMAN: To ask the Secretary of State for War if his attention has been directed to the fact that tents for the men to eat in which the War Office has supplied regularly for the past twelve years to Militia in permanent camps, have this year been refused to some Militia battalions; and, considering the discomfort to the men of being obliged to have their meals in the small tents in which they sleep, three to ten per tent, and have to keep and clean all their uniforms, arms and accoutrements, whether he will revert to the older practice, so as to avoid injuriously affecting recruiting for the Militia.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) Dining tents are still an authorised issue to Militia battalions, but there has hitherto been some difference of opinion among commanding officers as to their utility, and in many cases they have not been asked for by units. Nothing is known at the War Office of any issue being refused, as the matter is one for the General Officer Commanding concerned to settle locally.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Workmen's Compensation in the Transvaal.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): On behalf of the hon. Member for the Chesterfield Division of Derbyshire, I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention has been called to the accident at the Robinson Deep Mine on 26th April last, in which, through the rope breaking and the cage falling 2,000 feet, forty-three men were killed; and, if so, will he lay upon the Table of the House the verdict of the jury at the Coroner's inquest, and say whether, under the law of the Transvaal as at present administered, the dependents of those killed have any claim to compensation similar to what they would have under the law in this country.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. LYTTELTON, Warwick and Leamington): I am expecting a report from the Governor on the accident at the Robinson Deep Mine, but I am at present without definite information. I am informed that, under the common law of the Transvaal, the employer is liable for any injury sustained by his workmen, due to his own personal negligence or the negligence of any servant employed by him.

Crown Agents' Accounts.

SIR HENRY FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he will lay upon the Table of the House the audited accounts of the Crown Agents for the Colonies for the last three years.

*MR. LYTTELTON: I have already promised the hon. Member for the Chesterfield Division of Derbyshire to lay the Crown Agents' audited accounts for 1902, which is the last year for which audit has been completed, and I am prepared, in response to the right hon. Member's Question, to add the accounts for 1900 and 1901, but it will entail some delay in laying the Papers.

Transvaal Labour Ordinance Regulations.

SIR HENRY FOWLER: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies when the regulations which are now in force for carrying out the provisions of the Transvaal Labour Importation Ordinance, 1904, will be laid upon the Table of the House.

*MR. LYTTELTON: Papers relating to the regulations will, I expect, be in Members' hands to-morrow.

Native Labour in the Transvaal Mines—Vigilance Department.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL (Yorkshire, Cleveland): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that the Tables appended to the Report of the Transvaal Native Affairs Department, dated 31st March, 1904, show, under the heading Vigilance, that the inspectors of that department, in a period of two years, took action in thirteen cases of ill-treatment suffered by native labourers employed at the mines, and in twenty-eight cases of complaints of labourers with reference to wages, while in the same period they dealt with 3,341 cases of offences committed, or alleged to be committed, by native labourers; whether these inspectors are appointed mainly for the purpose of protecting the natives; and if he can state whether all the inspectors are acquainted with the languages chiefly used by the natives or are accompanied by interpreters, and whether there is any means by which the labourers are enabled to recognise an inspector.

*MR. LYTTELTON: The figures given are approximately correct. The duties of inspectors are described at pages 62 and 145 of Cd. 2025, page 20 of Cd. 904, and page 186 of Cd. 1551, and it will be seen that the definition of these duties has been made as wide as possible in order that the inspector may be able to "go into all questions affecting the comfort, health and happiness of natives employed in the mines, and to afford them opportunities of consulting him or of stating their grievances." I am not aware of the precise qualification of the inspectors or how they are recognised, but I have little doubt that they are all well known to the labourers. I will, however, make inquiry on the question. The importance of a knowledge of the language is fully recognised by the Transvaal Government and Sir Godfrey Lagden.

Wages of Chinese Labourers.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he is now able to say what are the wages which the Chinese labourers are to receive in the Transvaal; and what are the wages now paid to Kaffirs for underground labour in the mines.

*MR. LYTTELTON: The Chinese labourers will be either employed on piece work and will be able to earn about 50s. or more, the best workers should earn 60s; those not employed in piece work will receive wages according to the schedule at page 151 of Cd. 2025. If the average pay of those in the service of any employer does not equal 50s. for thirty working days within six months, the minimum rate will be increased from 1s. to 1s. 6d. per working day of ten hours. I understand from the above schedule that the present pay of Kaffirs for underground labour varies from 1s. 2d. to 2s. 6d. a day.

MR. MARKHAM (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield): May I ask why, in view of the right hon. Gentleman's statement that the pay will be 2s. a day, the minimum wage is reduced to 30s., and why the minimum rate of 50s. for the Kaffirs has not been insisted upon for the Chinese labourers?

*MR. LYTTELTON: It is not correct to say that the minimum rate for the Kaffirs is 50s. It is very much less. It is a little over 30s. a month. A long time would be needed to explain the exact reasons for keeping the minimum wage at the figure now stated, but Papers will be laid on the Table of the House to-morrow. The definite position I have endeavoured to uphold in the course of the discussion with Lord Milner is that the introduction of Chinese labour shall not be permitted in any way to undercut the Kaffir wages. I think that the hon. Member will see from the Papers that this object has been achieved.

MR. CROOKS (Woolwich): Are any banking arrangements being made for these poor men?

MR. WHITLEY (Halifax): Are the Chinamen to work thirty days per month?

*MR. LYTTELTON: That is certainly not the case.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.): Are they to work on Sundays?

*MR. LYTTELTON: No, Sir.

MAJOR SEELY (Isle of Wight): Is it not the fact that the minimum wage of Chinese labourers has now been reduced.

*MR. LYTTELTON: No.

Australian Parliament and the Chinese Labour Question.

MR. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether Resolutions have been passed recently by the two Houses of the Commonwealth of Australia Parliament respecting the introduction of Chinese labourers into South Africa; whether they were passed with unanimity, or, in case of divisions, what were the figures; and whether he will give the terms of the Resolutions.

*MR. LYTTELTON: Lord Northcote informs me that the Resolution was passed unanimously in the Senate, and by a large majority in the House of Representatives. The terms of the Resolutions are correctly set out in *The Times* of 18th March, at page 3.

MR. JOHN ELLIS: Why should we be referred to *The Times* newspaper for the terms?

[No answer was returned.]

Transvaal Magistracy.

MR. JOHN ELLIS: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he has now telegraphed Lord Milner for the information needful for the Return of names, ages, salaries, qualifications, experience, and previous careers of the persons appointed to be magistrates in the Transvaal, which was promised by him in February last, and with what result; and when the House may expect to be in possession of these particulars.

*MR. LYTTELTON: Lord Milner telegraphs to me that the despatch with the information required will reach me at the end of this week. I will present it without delay.

Native Convict Labour in the Mines.

MR. WHITLEY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he can now give the number of native convicts in the Transvaal Colony, and state how many are hired out for labour in the mines; and if he can say under what law natives, at the termination of a sentence, are sent to the mines against their will.

*MR. LYTTELTON: The total number of sentenced prisoners on 31st March of this year was 2,249. 875 were employed on the mines. I have no knowledge of any such practice as is referred to in the last part of the Question.

MR. WHITLEY: Does not the Blue-book issued last week contain information on this very point?

*MR. LYTTELTON: I think not.

MR. CROOKS: Who receives the wages of these convicts?

MR. WHITLEY: Will the right hon. Gentleman inquire as to the existence of the practice? Is it the custom after the sentence on a native has expired to hand him over to forced labour in the mines?

MR. LYTTELTON: Certainly I will inquire. I do not think that such a practice exists; but I quite agree that if it does it should be at once determined.

British Guiana Ordinance.

SIR HENRY FOWLER: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he will lay upon the Table of the House the correspondence between the India Office and the Colonial Office with reference to the British Guiana Ordinance, 1891.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): I have no objection to laying the correspondence mentioned on the Table, if my right hon. friend will move for it.

Congo Free State—Case of Silvanus Jones.

MR. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether His Majesty's Government are aware that Silvanus Jones, a native of Lagos, who was recently condemned to ten years penal servitude at Boma, in the Independent Congo State, had inadequate means of defence furnished him; whether the report of his trial and sentence, which His Majesty's Government have recently received, will be laid upon the Table; and whether His Majesty's Government are taking any further steps to safeguard the welfare of British subjects in the Independent Congo State.

*THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Earl PERCY, Kensington, S.): We will lay before Parliament the judgment in appeal; the Court confirmed the sentence, with a recommendation for its reduction, in view of the fact that Jones had acted under circumstances which justified him in thinking he had the approval of his superiors. While this judgment of the Court corroborates the justice of the complaints made by His Majesty's Government against the system of administration prevailing in the Congo State, we dissent strongly from the view that the conduct or approval of superiors can be pleaded in excuse for murders committed by their agents, but we have drawn the attention of the Congo Government to the allegation made by Mr. Jones that he had no knowledge of the charges to be preferred against him or even that he was himself to be placed on trial, and to the fact that no opportunity was allowed him of engaging counsel on his behalf, and we await explanations on these points.

Unclaimed Dividends on Government Stocks.

SIR JOHN LENG (Dundee): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether there is any reason against the publication of an Annual Return corresponding to the Alphabetical List of Intestate Estates which accompanies the Crown's Nominee Account, such Return to give an alphabetical list of dividends on Government stocks which have not been claimed during the previous ten years.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): I have already given the reasons why the publication of the List of Unclaimed Dividends was discontinued. These reasons do not, I understand, apply with the same force in the case of the Annual List of Intestate Estates.

Vagrancy Acts.

MR. SEYMOUR ORMSBY-GORE (Lincolnshire, Gainsborough): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department when the Government will be prepared to bring in legislation dealing with the Vagrancy Acts as a whole.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's): I am not aware that the Vagrancy Acts as a whole require amendment. The question whether the law with regard to vagrancy might not in some particulars be strengthened and extended is under consideration, but the matter is not ripe for any statement as to legislation.

Bethlehem Royal Hospital—Violation of Lunacy Act.

MR. CORRIE GRANT (Warwickshire, Rugby): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that Mrs. Helen Meredith was detained in Bethlehem Royal Hospital from 17th August to 25th September, 1903, without being taken before or visited by a judicial authority as prescribed by Section 8 of the Lunacy Act, 1890, although she signed, immediately on her admission on the 17th August, 1903, a notice of her desire to be taken before or visited by a justice, Judge, or magistrate having jurisdiction in the district within which she was detained; and, if so, will he say who is responsible for this violation of the Lunacy Act; and what steps will he take to prevent a repetition of it.

MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS: I understand, on inquiry, that the facts are as stated in the Question, but that the delay was due to causes for which the hospital authorities were not responsible. They forwarded the notice given by the lady in question without delay to the clerk to the justices, and it was in his proceedings for securing the attendance of a justice that the difficulty and delay occurred. I am making further inquiries with a view to ascertaining whether any steps can be taken to prevent the recurrence of such a case.

MR. CORRIE GRANT: Will the right hon. Gentleman give me an opportunity of hearing what is the explanation of the justices?

MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS: Yes, I will certainly communicate the answer to the hon. Member.

Sale of Adulterated Seeds.

MR. SPEAR (Devonshire, Tavistock): I beg to ask the hon. Member for North Huntingdonshire, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, what recent cases of adulteration or misrepresentation in the sale of farm seeds have been brought to his notice; and whether he has considered the advisability of some amendment in, or addition to, the law as it now stands for the better protection of agriculturists and honest seed merchants.

MR. AILWYN FELLOWES (Huntingshire, Ramsey): A case in which certain foreign seed was sold as English clover was recently brought under the notice of the Board. Proceedings were instituted under the Merchandise Marks Acts, and the vendor was fined £10 with 6s. Court fees and £21 towards the cost of the prosecution. This result goes to confirm the conclusion arrived at by the Departmental Committee of 1900, who expressed the opinion that there is no practical difficulty under the existing law in the way of obtaining thoroughly good and reliable seeds by those who know how to set about it; but 'we shall be very happy to give full consideration to any representations or suggestions which may be made to us on the subject.

Church Attendance of Children in School Hours.

Mr. LAWRENCE (Liverpool, Abercromby): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether the managers of a voluntary school have (subject to the conscience clause) the right to take children to church during school hours as a part of the religious instruction given in the school, and whether they can require the teacher to conduct the children to the church.

The PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY to the BOARD of EDUCATION (Sir William Anson, Oxford University): My attention has recently been called to the matters referred to in the Question, and the reply must depend on the construction to be placed on Section 7 (1) of the Elementary Education Act, 1870. That section allows a parent to withdraw his child from school on any day exclusively set apart for religious observance by the religious body to which the parent belongs; attendance at such observance does not appear to be equivalent to attendance at school, but the section would protect the parent, who alone is concerned, from any proceedings taken before magistrates for the non-attendance of his child at school on any such occasion. It follows that managers of a public elementary school have no right to take the school children to church during school hours; that religious teaching given in a church cannot be part of the instruction provided by the public elementary school, and that the teacher of the public elementary school cannot be required to conduct the children to church in any of the hours during which the school is open.

Aughris (Sligo) Pier.

Mr. WILLIAM McKILLOP (Sligo, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the pier and boatslip built at Aughris, county Sligo, are incomplete; and, in view of the fact that the completion and repair of those works cannot be undertaken by the Congested Districts Board, will he direct the Board of Works in Ireland, under the Marine Works Act or other powers, to have the pier and boatslip put in such a condition as will render them serviceable for the development of the fishing industry in that locality.

The CHIEF SECRETARY for IRELAND (Mr. Wyndham, Dover): The pier and boatslip were completed before their transference to the county authorities in 1889. An inspection made at low water last month showed that the works had suffered no damage or injury. The funds provided by the Marine Works Act have been fully allocated.

Dungannon Disturbances.

Mr. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that in Dungannon on the 12th instant two young men were beaten by the bandsmen of a Roman Catholic band which was parading the town; that one of the young men, named Reid, was so severely beaten that his life is at present not out of danger; and if he can state why Sergeant Montgomery, who witnessed the assault, refused to make any arrests, or assist in getting medical aid for the injured man; and what action, if any, does he propose to take in the matter.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The assault committed on this occasion was the result of a quarrel which was in no sense of a Party character. Two men were leading a horse through a crowded street; this was apparently resented by some persons in the crowd, and one of the two men was assaulted by a person unknown. But the bandsmen took no part whatever in the affair. Sergeant Montgomery did not witness the assault; he accompanied the man to a doctor, who stated the injury was superficial and not serious.

Redemption of Crown and Quit Rents, Etc.

Mr. GILHOOLY (Cork County, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state the terms of redemption to quit rents, Crown rents, and ecclesiastical and lay tithe rents, under the Ashbourne Acts and the Land Acts of 1896 and 1903 respectively.

Mr. WYNDHAM: I must refer the hon. Member to the Financial Secretary to the Treasury for information in respect of the redemption of quit and Crown rents. I am inquiring as to the terms of redemption respecting ecclesiastical and lay tithe rents, and will communicate with the hon. Member on the subject.

Irish Veterinary Department.

Mr. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that a memorial forwarded to the Department of Agriculture by the Catholic clerks in the veterinary branch of the Department, asking for an increment of salary, was suppressed by the chief clerk, who declined to forward the petition to the heads of the Department, and threatened that any attempt at a renewal of the application would be visited by dismissal; and, if so, whether he will state if the Department is willing to consider the alleged grievances of those officials.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The statement on which the first part of the Question is based is wholly without foundation and contains an unwarrantable reflection upon a public servant of distinguished and honourable service. The Department is at all times ready to consider the legitimate claims of its officers.

Mr. SLOAN: Are the Catholics referred to in this question Roman Catholics?

Mr. WYNDHAM: I have no knowledge.

Mr. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): At any rate, they do not belong to the Custom House persuasion.

The Memorial to Lord Salisbury.

Dr. FARQUHARSON (Aberdeenshire, W.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury what arrangements are to be made concerning the national memorial to Lord Salisbury; whether it is to be thrown open to competition; and who is to select the sculptor and decide on the site or the material of the statue.

The PRIME MINISTER and FIRST LORD of the TREASURY (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.): I must ask the hon. Gentleman to postpone this Question till after Whitsuntide.

Dr. FARQUHARSON: Certainly I will do so.

The Tibetan Mission.

Mr. LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Molton): I desire to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, in view of the fact that the House is at present debarred from discussing the Tibetan expedition, he will give a Parliamentary day for the discussion of the new development which has taken place.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: There is no new development of which I am aware, nor can I promise the day asked for. If any real reason for discussing this question were to arise, no doubt an occasion would be found.

Mr. FLYNN (Cork County, N.): Will the right hon. Gentleman advise his friends to remove the blocking Motion on the Paper?

[No answer was returned.]

The Fiscal Debate.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): I wish to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, in view of the fact that the Amendment standing in his name to the Motion of the hon. Member for Banffshire asking the House to express its confidence in the Administration, he will consider the propriety of giving a day for a debate of such importance?

Mr. MARKHAM: On a point of order, I wish to call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that the Prime Minister's Amendment was handed in after you had left the Chair last night. Last year I handed in to the Table an Amendment which was refused on the ground that the Speaker had left the Chair. I wish to know whether it is in order for the clerks at the Table to give special privileges to Ministers of the Crown.

*Mr. SPEAKER: As the House knows, the clerks at the Table are not in the habit of making distinctions between Members of the House, and I regret that the hon. Member should have made an unfair attack upon them. I know nothing about the case of the hon. Member last year. What happened last night was that the Prime Minister brought to the Table his Amendment and handed it in before I left the Chair; but as the Clerk of the House found parts of it somewhat illegible the Prime Minister was writing out those parts at the Table more clearly when I left the Chair. In those circumstances, it would have been improper and discourteous if the Clerk of the House had refused to receive the Amendment.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: With regard to the Question of my hon. friend the Member for King's Lynn, the Motion standing in my name is partly of the nature which he has ascribed to it. But it is also, and perhaps mainly, a reasoned form of putting the previous Question, for which I hope to convince the House to-night there is ample reason. Until I see further grounds for taking the course suggested by my hon. friend, I certainly could not pledge myself to adopt it.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES: The right hon. Gentleman will consider, I hope, that it is he himself who raises this question of confidence.

PUBLIC PETITIONS COMMITTEE.

Sixth Report brought up, and read; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

SEA FISHERIES BILL [Lords].

Read the first time; to be read a second time upon Tuesday, 31st May, and to be printed. [Bill 212.]

NEW BILLS.

LUNACY BILL.

"To amend the Lunacy Acts," presented by Mr. Attorney-General; supported by Mr. Solicitor-General; to be read a second time upon Tuesday 31st May, and to be printed. [Bill 210.]

GOVERNMENT SHIPS BILL.

"To make provision with respect to ships which belong to His Majesty, or are held on behalf of or for the benefit of the Crown, but do not form part of His Majesty's Navy," presented by Mr. Pretyman; supported by Mr. Gerald Balfour and Mr. Arthur Lee; to be read a second time upon Thursday, 2nd June, and to be printed. [Bill 211.]

MONUMENT TO THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY.

Resolution reported, "That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty praying that His Majesty will give directions that a Monument be erected in the Collegiate Church of St. Peter, Westminster, to the memory of the late Right hon. the Marquess of Salisbury with an Inscription expressive of the high sense entertained by the House of his rare and splendid gifts and of his devoted labours in Parliament and in great Offices of State; and to assure His Majesty that this House will make good the Expenses attending same."

Resolution agreed to.

To be presented by Privy Councillors and Members of His Majesty's Household.

FINANCE BILL.

[Second Reading.]

Order read, for resuming adjourned debate on Question (16th May), "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Question again proposed.

*Mr. CLANCY (Dublin County, N.) said: It was hardly to be expected, and no one has expected, that this Bill would be allowed to pass without a protest from the representatives of Ireland against any measure of the kind, and without at the same time an attempt on their part once more to induce reasonably-minded Englishmen to assist them in removing the extremely serious grievance under which they conceive their country to labour in the shape of over-taxation. But, however this may be, it is simply impossible for Irish Members anxious to do their duty to their constituents to neglect such an opportunity as the present of denouncing that grievance as forcibly as they can, for they believe it to be largely responsible for the stagnant condition of all Irish industries and for the appalling emigration which, to all appearance, threatens in a space of time easily measureable to leave the land of Ireland—one of the most fruitful on the face of the earth—all but a desert. The Irish people are often told that what they ought to do is to keep quiet and encourage English capital to flow into Ireland. Such talk seems to them simply impudent mockery. They would not, to their thinking, require a shilling of English capital for the ordinary purposes of industrial enterprise if this Parliament did not rob them of Irish capital in various ways and by various devices, amongst the most effective of which, as they believe, is the device of over-taxation. Taking this serious view of the matter, we are bound, on every available occasion, in season and out of season, to do what we can by discussion in the House to put an end to so fruitful a cause of national disaster and ruin. But, if we were tempted or inclined to forget or ignore this vital subject at other times and under other circumstances, there are two facts which would prevent us from lapsing into such a dereliction of duty on the present occasion. Only a few weeks ago the Chief Secretary for Ireland himself reminded us all of this financial grievance in words which were so apt that we cannot soon forget them, and by which he plainly admitted that the taxation of Ireland for Imperial purposes had begun to reach the danger point at which it should not be increased. The only difference between the right hon. Gentleman and ourselves on this point is that, whereas he thought Imperial taxation was only beginning to reach the danger point in Ireland, we hold that it has long since reached that point and passed it, and that we are at this moment, and have long been, feeling the effects of—to use the mildest language—such reckless disregard of Irish interests as successive Chancellors of the Exchequer have shown. The admission made by the Chief Secretary, even though it did not go far enough, is surely enough, coming from him, to arouse every Irish Member to a sense of the deadly peril in which Imperial taxation has placed his country.

But the second fact is not less but rather more disturbing. It is presented by this Finance Bill which, as usual, is framed to meet the needs and interests of Great Britain and without a thought of Ireland, and actually proposes, after all that has been said, not to mitigate but to increase the grievance of which we complain. I will now turn to what has actually happened, and, to avoid going into what is called ancient history, I shall begin with the last financial year with which the Royal Commission on Financial Relations dealt in its Report. According to the Treasury Returns the true revenue from Ireland for 1893–4 was £7,568,649. From that time onward it has steadily increased, almost every year, till in 1902–3 it reached the unprecedented total of £10,205,500. In 1903–4 it fell, owing to the decrease in the taxation carried by the late Chancellor of the Exchequer, to an estimated total of £9,925,500. This year, on the best estimate I can make, the revenue extracted from the Irish people will be the largest recorded—namely, £10,378,000. To this enormous increase almost every tax has contributed. No class of the Irish community has been spared. The Irish landlords and the other so-called loyalists of Ireland fear, or profess to fear, that they would be plundered under Home Rule. I wonder that they do not see that they are being pretty well fleeced under British rule. For example, the proceeds of the income-tax rose from £653,417 in 1893–4 to £1,201,000 in 1902–3; that is to say, the produce of this tax has about doubled in ten years. In the present year it will, as I calculate, stand at £1,000,000. The death duties produced £473,927 in 1893–4, since then they have fluctuated considerably, but the tendency has on the whole been upward, and last year they produced about £200,000 more than ten years ago. In my opinion, if the members of the propertied classes in Ireland who cling to the Union as their sheet anchor only continue to do so for a few years more they will find themselves stripped to the skin by their supposed protectors against their own countrymen. Altogether, the direct taxation of Ireland rose steadily, with few fluctuations, from £1,375,944 in 1893–4 to £2,252,000 in 1901–2, and fell, as I calculate it, to only £1,847,000 last year. This year it will be about £1,870,000, or about £500,000 more than eleven years ago, and the increase has been mainly brought about by increases in the rates of taxation.

But it is when we turn to the record of indirect taxation that the addition to our burdens becomes really alarming, because indirect taxation is borne in Ireland chiefly by the poor. In 1893–4 the indirect taxes produced £5,267,775; in 1902–3 they produced £6,890,000—an increase of £1,622,225 in less than ten years. Again, this increase was mainly caused by increased rates of taxation on the very articles most consumed by the poor, and as the poor, relatively speaking, largely predominate in Ireland, it has in that proportion more affected Ireland than England or than Scotland. In raising the tax on tea, for instance, the one part of the three kingdoms which is most severely hit is the poorest Province of Ireland, namely Connaught, because tea and bread have come there particularly to supply the place of dearer food, such as meat, which the people cannot purchase. Moreover, this injustice is aggravated because, when the tax on tea was raised, that on coffee was left as it was; coffee, relatively speaking, being much more largely consumed in England than in Ireland. In the case of tobacco the increase also hit the poor more than the rich, because they were less able to pay for it, and therefore, for the reason I have just given, hit Ireland much more severely than Great Britain. Even when the tax on tobacco was reduced in 1897–8 from 3s. 2d. to 2s. 8d., to prevent the poor throughout the three kingdoms, and therefore Ireland particularly, from getting the full benefit of the reduction, you reduced the extent of moisture allowed—that was, you made the cheaper kind of tobacco dearer than it would otherwise have been. As to the tax on alcohol, that has not been increased in the last ten years, confessedly because it could not have been increased with profit, but the injustice of the past in regard to this matter has been maintained, that is to say, as the result of half a century of legislation drink for Englishmen has been cheapened and drink for Irishmen, who are and have been the less bibulous and the more sober nation of the two, has been about quadrupled. In fact, some British drinks, such as cider and British wines, which before 1830 were as heavily taxed as beer, have not been taxed at all since that year.

But let us come back to the result of the last ten years taxation operations. That result has been to add about £3,000,000 a year, speaking roughly, to our total taxation. To put it in other words, while at the beginning of the late reign the taxation was at the rate of 12s. 11d. per head of the population, it was about £2 16s. 2d. per head in 1902–3. Surely no just or fair-minded Englishman can regard such a development as that without some qualms of conscience; surely no Irishman can regard it with equanimity. Does anyone really believe that Ireland can endure it for very long? And where is the process going to stop? If this country, in the real or supposed interest of the Empire, chooses to embark in another great war within the next few years, and if, as a consequence, fresh taxes are imposed and the taxation of Ireland is thereby increased by another £3,000,000, does anyone really think that the result to Ireland will not be disaster felt throughout the whole field of her industry and commerce? Let me give a few illustrations of the magnitude of this yearly addition to the taxation of Ireland. It more than equals the whole liability incurred during the last twenty years in providing dwellings for the working classes in both urban and rural districts in Ireland. It is more than five times the agricultural grant voted in 1898. It is more than sixteen times the amount of the development grant of last year, to which we are looking so much for improvements in our social system. It is nearly seventeen times the revenue of the new Agricultural Department, which we have been bidden to regard with reverence as the great fount of our material regeneration. It is more than thirty times the revenue of the Congested Districts Board, whose special care is the relief of congestion and the perennial poverty caused by congestion in the West of Ireland. It exceeds many times all the other grants made to Ireland since 1890, including the produce of the local licence duties, the estate duty grant, the Customs and Excise duties grant of 1890, and the Exchequer contribution of 1891. It exceeds the aggregate of all the grants put together, and all voted moneys devoted to other purposes in Ireland than those of law, police, and Dublin Castle. The Government hands over to us considerable sums for local purposes, for which it is admitted that money must be found, and after they have done so they deliberately put their hands in our pockets, and unscrupulously take out again not only all they have put in, but several times as much besides, protesting all the while that they are our generous benefactors, and that Ireland which is thus fleeced is the unreasonable and insatiable spoilt child of the Empire. I call all that mere thieving, tempered with hypocrisy. But the worst feature, of course, of the whole exasperating business is that this addition to our taxation has been imposed on a country whose population and whose wealth have both been declining. We all remember how the Government of the late Transvaal Republic used to be denounced by the representatives of the mining industry on the Rand, and by their representatives in this House, both on and off the Government Benches, because it increased the taxation on that industry in proportion to its gains. But in the case of Ireland what has been done is to increase its taxation in spite of its losses in men and money. In 1893–4, when our total taxation was, as I have stated, £7,568,649, the population of Ireland was 4,500,599. Last financial year, when our taxation had, as I have shown, risen to all but £10,000,000, our population had still further declined to about 4,430,000. Is not this single fact in itself the severest condemnation that could be passed on the so-called system of equal and indiscriminate taxation? What a sarcastic comment it is on all the talk we hear about the advantages of a poor country being linked with a rich one, especially when the rich one chooses to embark in wars of aggression, and drags the poor one after it in its costly enterprises?

The decline in the population of Ireland is the most unmistakable proof that can be adduced of material retrogression. No country on the face of the globe which is really prosperous is losing its population. No really prosperous country has ever suffered such a loss by emigration as Ireland has endured during the last half-century, and is still enduring. During the last three years, despite your agricultural grants, development grants, and new Departments, the emigration from Ireland has been twice as great as that from Scotland, and eight times as great as that from England. People in the prime of life, such as are the great majority of Irish emigrants, do not fly from prosperous conditions; they fly because they see no chance of success in life in the land of their birth. But the steady decline in the population of Ireland and the never-ending tide of emigration are not the only infallible signs of its increasing poverty. The statistics of pauperism are very startling. In 1864 the daily average number of paupers was 11 per 1,000 of the population. In 1894 it had risen to 21 per 1,000. In 1903, the last year for which we have Returns, it rose to one in every forty-four. Can any one possibly mistake the significance of such figures as those? What a startling refutation they are of the theory that, though the emigration has been great, the lot of those who have remained behind has improved! And pauperism in Ireland is not of the same kind and does not arise from the same causes as in England. In this country it is both spasmodic and sporadic. It is caused by sudden fluctuations in industries and disappears with the restoration of the normal conditions of trade. In Ireland it is produced by the normal conditions of society, and is a grim and permanent feature of Irish social life.

Let me take one test more. The income-tax is not one of the best tests, but it is some test. It is surely a remarkable fact that in 1893–4, when the rate of income-tax was only 7d. in the £., 1d. yielded over £93,000, while in 1902–3, when the rate was raised to 1s. 3d., the yield per 1d. was only £85,400. When my hon. friend the Member for West Islington, two or three years ago, brought out this striking fact out of the fulness of his knowledge of this whole subject, the then Chancellor of the Exchequer affected to answer him in three ways. He said first that a certain amount of income-tax was lost by reason of large estates which paid the tax being broken up by sales under the Land Acts into small estates which were exempt; and he relied so much on that statement that he repeated it a year later. But it will not hold water. When money is substituted for land the owner does not cease to pay income-tax. Right good care is taken that he will continue to pay it on the dividends received from his investments. But there is an even more conclusive answer to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Bristol. The income from trades and professions is a rough test of the material condition of any country. Take my own profession—that of the law. If business outside the Courts improves, it inevitably happens that business inside the Courts improves too; and *vice versa.* It is, therefore, most significant that the income assessed under Schedule D in Ireland, in regard to which nothing has happened similar to that which has occurred in the case of income from land, was in 1903 less by more than £1,000,000 than it was ten years before, while the income assessed under Schedule C—the income from funds—declined from £723,000 in 1893 to £616,000 in 1901. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Bristol, again, said that landlords in Ireland paid on a lower basis than landlords in England, because, while English landlords paid on their rents received, the Irish landlords paid on the valuation, if it was lower than the rent. That, again, will not hold water. It is notorious that rents of agricultural land in England, without any Land Act, have been brought down by the absence of competition for the land lower than any rents in Ireland or than even the valuation where that was lowest. The Member for West Bristol said, finally, that the exemptions and abatements made in recent years accounted largely for the decline in the yield of the income-tax in Ireland; but, even that cannot be admitted, for there is a larger gap in Ireland than in Great Britain between the large incomes which were always taxed and the small incomes which always escaped, and so the decline in the yield remains without any adequate explanation but one, namely, that the country as a whole is steadily suffering an increasing loss in every element of wealth.

I dare say we shall have once again the old arguments based on the increase of deposits in the banks and the receipts of the railways. It will not now avail. It is threadbare. As to the increase in the bank deposits, it is perfectly notorious that it is a sign not of progress, but of retrogression. The money of Ireland would not be in the banks at such rates of interest as 1½ and 2 per cent. if Ireland were prosperous; it would be invested in industrial enterprises at 5 and 6 per cent., and the difference between the case of Ireland and that of Great Britain in respect of this matter is that, whereas the English bank deposits represent surplus capital, in Ireland they represent practically the whole capital of the country, an insignificant fraction excepted. Then there are the everlasting railway receipts which, we are told, are increasing. Yes, they have been increasing. But at what rate? While the receipts from the railways in Great Britain have increased from a little over £22,000,000 in 1870 to nearly £43,000,000 in 1903, the receipts from the Irish railways increased in the same time from £1,000,000 to only a little over £1,500,000, and, moreover, I suppose those receipts include the large sums paid out of the rates in aid of the guaranteed lines. The argument based on this increase in railway receipts in Ireland reminds me, in fact, of the plea of the baby-farmers. The children whom they starved to death developed, it is true, during their brief lives; they actually weighed more when they were dead than they did when they were born; but they would not die so soon if their physical development were in the natural healthful ratio.

But what need have I to resort to Blue-books or statistics, or figures? Is not the evidence of our eyes sufficient without those aids? When I go through this country and behold its countless hives of industry, its palaces, and mansions, and comfortable cottage homes, its teeming millions producing wealth greater than that of "Ormuz or of Ind," its ports crowded with ships trading between England and all parts of the world, and then turn to my own country and observe the grass-grown streets of many of its towns, the dilapidated buildings, the idle mills, once the scene of thriving business, its thousands of acres going to waste or remaining in pasture while tens of thousands of people are in need of land, and its principal ports crowded weekly with thousands of able-bodied emigrants flying as if from a plague, I begin to think that all statistics are useless or misleading in face of the proofs, huge as a mountain, open, palpable, of the nation's decay. The truth is—and no arguments, however specious, nor statements however sophistical, can hide the fact—that you have not only been increasing enormously the taxation of Ireland, but that you have been doing so with full knowledge of the fact that she has been, unlike England, growing more and more unable to bear it. In point of fact, economic decay is the natural and inevitable result of excessive taxation in every country which is over-taxed. Over-taxation depletes the wealth of a country, paralyses trade and industry, disheartenes the people, takes away hope and expectation alike, and induces every man of enterprise to fly to some land under happier conditions. Notwithstanding, however, this enormous addition to our taxation, we shall be told, as we were told in 1902 by the then Chancellor of the Exchequer, that our proportionate contribution to Imperial expenses has been greatly reduced. It is something like one-fiftieth instead of one-twentieth, said that right hon. Gentleman, and surely that is not too much to ask Ireland to pay. Although, by the way, if that were the correct figure, it would be higher than we ought to pay according to the greatest statistician in these kingdoms, Sir Robert Giffen, who in 1886 estimated the taxable capacity of Ireland, which was greater then than it is now, at one-fiftieth that of Great Britain.

But before I give the obvious answer to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Bristol, let me offer a protest once more against the jugglery in figures by which Ireland's proportionate contribution is set down in the Treasury Returns. That contribution is made out by debiting to Ireland expenditure which is really laid out here and ought to be debited to Great Britain. When the Treasury wants to find out the amount of money spent on Ireland the rule adopted is to account as expenditure on Ireland what is spent there. But when it is desired to find out the amount spent on England this rule is discarded. For example, almost every penny spent on the Army and Navy, in works of construction and in the manufacture of arms and ammunition, is spent in Great Britain, and the result has been the creation of industries which give continuous employment to tens of thousands of skilled and ordinary workmen. If the Treasury followed the rule they themselves have laid down in the case of Ireland, all that expenditure would be regarded as English expenditure. But what they actually do is to put all this vast expenditure to the account of the Empire, and thus it is that they bring out the final result of making it appear that England has millions less spent upon her than is actually the case and, therefore, contributes millions more in proportion to the Empire than Ireland. But let me take the figure set down as correct. Can anything else be expected than that Ireland's proportion of contribution to Imperial expenses would go down with an increase in the taxes on the basis of what is called equal and indiscriminate taxation? It stands to reason that, as long as Ireland is the poorer country of the two, that must be the case. If I wanted authority for this proposition I have it here in the words of the Chief Secretary spoken on the occasion to which I have already referred. The right hon. Gentleman is reported to have stated in this House—

> "He had heard it said by hon. Members sitting for English constituencies, that considering the proportionate contribution of Ireland for Imperial purposes, she was not entitled to any exceptional treatment; but that argument would not bear the test of examination. He contended that the allocation of the savings effected in the course of Irish Government to Irish purposes was based upon economic facts—upon the fact that Ireland's arrested development was not only an evil for her, but deprived her of all financial elasticity, and it so happened that Ireland's proportionate contribution was smaller than it might otherwise have been. If the same taxes were imposed in both countries, Ireland, being the poorer country, would produce a relatively smaller amount for those taxes than they would produce in England. Again, if higher taxes were imposed, such as a war tax, the returns from England would quickly respond; but in Ireland they were beginning to touch the danger point at which taxation ought not to be increased."

In point of fact, the existing taxation might be increased to such an extent that Ireland's contribution would appear a minus quantity, although we should be actually paying much more than we are paying at present. I think I may leave this point now, and I hope we shall hear no more about it in defence of the system on which Ireland is taxed.

I come next to the question of relative taxable capacity and the extent to which Ireland is now over-taxed as compared with Great Britain. But I need not dwell much on that point. The Royal Commission over which Mr. Childers presided has practically settled that point for ever. That Commission comprised the most distinguished financial experts whom Great Britain could produce when it was appointed. But that fact has not saved it from the sneers of persons from whom sneers might have been least expected. The criticisms passed upon its work, however, have been absolutely irrelevant. I call attention to this fact, that what has been assailed in its Report is not the accuracy of any statement made in that document but the fact that, in accordance with the terms of the reference made to it, it dared to consider Great Britain and Ireland as separate fiscal entities for the purposes of the inquiry which it was appointed to conduct. It might have been wrong in doing so, though it is hard to see how it could have been; but if the House supposes it to have been right in taking the cases of England and Ireland separately, not only is there no answer, but none has even been attempted, to the main conclusion—that Ireland was over-taxed in 1894, in comparison with Great Britain, to the extent, at least, of something between £2,500,000 and £2,750,000 a year. Most Irishmen thought it an under-estimate; but let it stand. What the exact figure ought to be now I will not attempt to say; but it requires no argument to show that, if the over-taxation of Ireland reached nearly £3,000,000 in 1894, it must now necessarily largely exceed that amount, since no one in this House or out of it who is not a fool will venture for a moment to deny that, while Ireland has declined in the last ten or eleven years in every element of wealth, Great Britain has advanced in the opposite direction by leaps and bounds. The argument of the Chancellor of the Exchequer in the debate yesterday was that the country was progressing, and that it was better able to stand the strain of taxation than in former times. Of course the right hon. Gentleman meant Great Britain when he made that statement.

The Prime Minister in the concluding speech yesterday stated that while expenditure had increased since 1864, Great Britain was far better able to sustain the increased expenditure now than it was to sustain the low expenditure of forty years ago. What is the answer to this indictment? I am almost ashamed to examine once more the threadbare pleas of successive Chancellors of the Exchequer. To notice them once again seems to attach to them an importance which they do not possess. Everyone of them has been answered again and again, and notwithstanding that fact they are put forward on every fresh occasion as if they had never been answered at all. It is said that, the same taxes being imposed throughout the three kingdoms, no grievance can exist since all are thus taxed alike. In past years Irish Members have contended, and I myself especially have contended, that that was exactly Ireland's grievance, and the head and front of Great Britain's offending, for by the Act of Union this Parliament is bound not to tax Ireland on the same level as Great Britain till the circumstances of the two countries have become similar—which has never been the case. The late Chancellor the Member for West Bristol more than once affected to deny this proposition, and would not hear of such an interpretation of the Seventh Article of the Treaty of Union. I always thought his denials were unworthy of him, and I have never heard them supported by more than the right hon. Gentleman's *ipse dixit.* Consequently, I for one will never give up the Irish argument based on the Act of Union. It is in my opinion absolutely unassailable. But let me discard it for this occasion, and take the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Bristol and those who agree with him on their own ground. Let me admit, for the sake of argument, that there is no warrant in history or legislation for separate treatment for Ireland in the matter of taxation. Is indiscriminate taxation, therefore, necessarily just? Does identity of the rates of taxation necessarily imply an equality of burthen? Will the present Chancellor of the Exchequer seriously maintain that neither Egypt nor India would be injured if precisely the same rate and kind of taxation as prevails in England were imposed on those two countries? Would the same tax on wines in France and England mean the same thing to France as to England? But it is absurdities like these which are involved in the assertion so glibly and confidently made that there can be no injustice to Ireland, because the same taxes are levied there as in Great Britain. When articles more generally used in Ireland than in England, such as whiskey, are taxed the same throughout, Ireland is hit and England escapes *pro tanto.* When an article like tea which is used more amongst the poor than amongst the rich is taxed, the poor are hit and the rich escape *pro tanto*, and Ireland again is specially hit because she has more poor in proportion than England. When tobacco is taxed, the burden again falls with greater severity on the poor than on the rich, and Ireland again, because she has more poor in proportion than England, is specially hit. Suppose, again, that an equal tax were levied throughout Great Britain and Ireland on exports of coal and iron. Here, too, there would be equal, indiscriminate, and, according to the English contention, just taxation; yet in this case Ireland would altogether escape and Great Britain alone would be hit, for the coal and iron industries are British industries, and Ireland, fortunately or unfortunately for herself, can boast of neither of those industries. In point of fact, the plea drawn from this system of so-called equal and indiscriminate taxation is patent nonsense and founded on falsehood.

I may be told—we have always been told—that this is an English grievance also, as there are poor people in Great Britain as well as in Ireland. I might answer, as I have answered on previous occasions similar to this, that the Act of Union, by which England so jealously stands in other matters, guarantees the Irish people immunity from it, even though the English people themselves choose to endure it and suffer from it; but I shall not use that argument now, though I will never abandon it. Let it be that the poor in both countries suffer. But surely it is plain that the suffering is not equal. Here the poor amongst the teeming millions of prosperous people are a comparative few; in Ireland they are, practically speaking, almost the entire nation. Here there are poor districts, no doubt; but they are surrounded on all sides by rich districts which maintain them and by numberless industries to which they can resort; whereas, in the greater part of Ireland, the poverty is unrelieved by any such admixture or any such accompaniment. In some districts along the western sea-board the annual family budget foots up scarcely to a score of pounds sterling. The nearest field of employment is England, and in times of distress the rate for the relief of the poor mounts up to such figures as seven and eight shillings in the pound and is paid by people many of whom are themselves on the verge of poverty. It is, therefore, absolute nonsense to talk of equality of suffering; besides, the fact that there are poor districts in England which are specially hit by the present system of taxation is no reason for continuing to injure

Ireland; and, accordingly, whether we look at this system of so-called equal and indiscriminate taxation from the point of view of the historic and legislative rights of Ireland, or as a means specially calculated for plundering the poor for the benefit of the rich, it seems from the Irish standpoint equally unjust and infamous.

It is said, again, that Ireland is exempt from some taxes which are levied in England. I wonder why those who make that point are not ashamed to do so. For what do those taxes amount to which are levied in England and not in Ireland? I have totted them up, and altogether they amount to £3,000,000 or £4,000,000, or one-fortieth part of the total revenue of Great Britain and Ireland. Supposing that those taxes were enacted for Ireland, how much does the Chancellor of the Exchequer imagine he would get out of them? I venture to say that their produce would not pay a quarter of the cost of collection. Imagine a tax in Ireland on armorial bearings. We have not got any armorial bearings. England took them away when she took away the Irish Parliament; and if we had any I am certain England would tax them as in this country. It is said again that there is a set-off in the shape of excessive expenditure in Ireland. The answer of Ireland to this plea has been made again and again and has never been answered in turn. Let me repeat it as briefly as I can. In the first place, if expenditure could be a set-off to taxation, no country in the world could be said to be over-taxed, and even Turkey must, on this hypothesis, be free from such a reproach. The hypothesis is intrinsically absurd. But in the case of Ireland it is not only absurd, but audacious. For what are the objects of the Imperial expenditure in Ireland? Broadly speaking, the bulk of that expenditure is and has been necessitated by the attempts of this country to govern Ireland without its consent. The money is spent in dragooning and corruption. England holds Ireland by force and by bribery, and it is thus the money goes. But what audacity is required to describe expenditure of this nature as a set-off. Of recent years, it is true, money has been devoted to other objects. But whose money? Take the revenue of the Congested Districts Board. Almost the whole of the capital at the disposal of that body is drawn from the Irish Church Surplus. The funds of the new Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction are mostly drawn from the same source. The endowments of the Intermediate Education Board and of the Royal University are supplied from the same fount. Even the pensions of the Irish national teachers are in great part similarly provided. The Agricultural Grant, the Estate Duty Grant, the Customs and Excise Grant, and the Development Grant of last year are the equivalents of similar grants made first in England and Scotland and are in no sense British money. If they had not been made, Ireland would now be contributing the aggregate of all those grants in aid of English and Scotch local purposes. So that it comes to this that, so far as the monies voted by this House for useful or reproductive Irish purposes are concerned, all come out of Irish pockets. Even the bonus of £12,000,000 provided by the Land Act of last year for the purchase of Irish land is to be got by taking the whole amount out of grants already made to Ireland for other purposes. You call this British liberality; you count it, forsooth, as a set-off; but you will not impose on the Irish public at least by such tricks of debate. The English Parliament may over-tax because it has the power. But it has not the power to make black white, and this plea of a set-off cannot be made to look to Irish eyes as other than an imposture.

Now, all this I call a very shameful record. England has a giant's strength as regards Ireland, and it has been tyrannous enough to use it like a giant. It has had a small and weak nation completely in its grip, and while it has been glad enough to use the services of its sons on every field of battle, it has not been ashamed to requite that nation for those services by robbing it, as if it had just conquered Ireland in war and were exacting from it a ransom. What strikes one most about this story is the unintermitted persistence in wrong-doing. Since the amalgamation of the Exchequer in 1817 there has scarcely ever been a Chancellor of the Exchequer who has not been engaged in one or more predatory expeditions in Ireland. In whatever other field of administration or legislation mis-government of that country may have been modified; in the field of finance, England has consistently acted for nearly a century in a manner which suggests that the object nearest the hearts of successive Governments was to bleed the Irish people to death. I have heard virtuous protestations in this House against such charges or any charges involving deliberate malignity to Ireland on the part of British statesmen, and I suppose we shall hear similar protests again to-day. I could understand those virtuous protestations if it could be shown that English statesmen in the past were not made aware of the real nature of the results to Ireland of over-taxation. But it is too much to ask the Irish Members to believe in their sincerity, in face of all that has been written and spoken on this subject by Irishmen, and even by some Englishmen, in the interest of Ireland during the last half century. But for argument's sake let me put deliberate malignity out of the case. What remains? What remains is nearly as reprehensible; for the only alternative conclusion is that England has thought exclusively of British interests, has wholly disregarded Irish interests, and has cared not a jot whether Ireland sank or swam, provided England was safe. It appears to me at least that the latter accusation is only a shade less serious than the other, while the result to Ireland has been the same. The saying of Grattan, like so many of his sayings, has been verified to the letter—

> "A nation that loses its liberties, loses its revenues."

And whether this result has been brought about deliberately, or without thought, it is one which to all Irishmen must be a source of indignation. "Evil is wrought by want of thought as well as want of heart." To the Nationalist majority at least this financial grievance appears large enough to justify an insurrection, if an insurrection were possible, and we, the representatives here of that majority, should be more or less than men, if, while it remained unredressed, we did not continue to denounce it as an infamous wrong, without even a rag of justification or excuse.

*MR. WALDRON (Dublin, St. Stephen's Green) said that if the expenditure of this great country had reached a figure to cause alarm to her statesmen and economists, what must be the position of Ireland in relation to her share of such expenditure? The British expenditure, however great, however dangerous to her financial stability, however disorganising to her credit, was at any rate sanctioned by her Parliamentary representatives, or the great majority of them. It was undertaken for objects of which Englishmen in the main approved, and it was possible—though personally he held the opposite opinion—that it might in the future improve the markets for English manufacturers' exports and so to some extent be justified. But it had been incurred for purposes objected to at every step by the majority of the representatives of Ireland, for purposes which they held conferred upon that country no benefits of any sort. They practically had no manufactures, no articles to export save cattle, sheep, and horses, and the vast military and naval expenditure to which, in the face of their reasonable and repeated protests, they were compelled to contribute, opened up no new markets for agricultural produce. When the Financial Relations Commission issued its Report in 1896, the Irish taxation was £8,031,000—for the year ending March, 1904, it was £9,500,000, and for the year ending March, 1905, it would be over £10,000,000. The Financial Relations Commission was appointed because Mr. Parnell said that the fixed Imperial contribution of £2,500,000 was excessive, and now, after eight years, with about 170,000 to 180,000 less of population, they found the Imperial contribution raised undoubtedly by £300,000. What was to be the end of this system—for what purposes were such monstrous taxes raised? He was acquainted with the doctrine of the set-off, but he thought it had been so often expressed that it was hardly necessary for him to say more than a few words about it. It consisted in setting up as a counterbalance to these taxes the fact that about £7,000,000 was re-spent in Ireland. Yes, but how? In continuing, against the wishes of the great majority of the people, a system of law and police, the most expensive, in relation to the population of the people, in the world, by a Civil Service comprised for the most part of non-representative non-elected boards. These things were not required in Ireland, and they were increasingly and justly protested against. Let him give a few figures to illustrate his meaning. In Belgium with a population of over 6,500,000, law and police cost only £1,400,000, while Ireland, with 4,500,000, cost £2,200,000. He believed that some of the economies for the Land Act—indeed, most of the £250,000—was to come off that, but even after that abatement it would stand at some £500,000 above Belgium. Further, it was treated as an Irish charge, when no one would deny that probably one-half of it was fairly an Imperial charge. And so they could go on through the whole weary list of items.

It might be asked how this system was to be altered as regarded taxes levied under the general law of the country. He confessed he had very little hope, unless a fixed Imperial contribution was arrived at. Even if such fixed contribution was taken at the sum, found to be admittedly excessive, of £2,500,000 in this year, if there was a method of putting Irish savings to separate Irish funds for Irish purposes, they would still be some £300,000 to the good. He should have thought that every Chancellor of the Exchequer, from the very nature of his studies, would have been in favour of economy. Could he conceive of a system less likely to develop it than the one which prevailed now? There was no incentive to save. It was a commonplace of Irish life that they should get as much as they could out of the Treasury, though he thought the Treasury was much better able to protect itself than was the Irish taxpayer to raid the Treasury. If this were done, he for one would welcome the government of Ireland, without any Party representation, by what was called, in the language of the day, a great pro-Consul. He believed that any capable administrator of the type of Lord Cromer or Lord Curzon or Sir Antony MacDonnell—he thought, even for financial justice, they should not care to have Lord Milner—given a fixed Imperial contribution, would provide Ireland with nationalised railways and nationalised waterways, and save in addition £1,000,000 for other useful purposes in Ireland. If they would not give to Ireland the right to manage her own local affairs, they were bound to take some steps to prevent her being taxed to death. Ireland, if she paid a fixed Imperial contribution of, say, £2,000,000 a year, would then be at liberty to do what, in his opinion, she herself, or whoever was responsible for her financial management, ought to be able to do—viz., to think parochially, to turn from the standard of this wealthy country to the modest arrangements of Switzerland, or some other small agricultural European country. If that were done, he believed that Irishmen who thought that the Union was best for Ireland, or those who, like himself, thought they should be left to manage their own local affairs on their own soil, would both find their country wealthier and happier.

*MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.) said the situation was an extremely interesting one; no English Members were present, and they might almost imagine that this was an Irish Parliament with certain limitations. He believed that every Irish representative knew that whatever he said, and however cogent his arguments or reasonable his demands, nothing would come of it, and the whole combined representation of Ireland would find itself quite powerless to influence the Government in this matter. His hon. friend had sketched a rather large programme, and he would remind him that there was an agitation on foot to diminish the number of Irish Members. The hon. Member for St. Stephen's Green had said, "Sweep them all away." They might as well be swept away for the power they exercised in Parliament. The hon. Member had asked that a pro-Consul should be appointed for Ireland on the lines of government adopted in Switzerland. He could well understand a Nationalist Member making such a proposal, if it were only to call attention more forcibly to the most infamous system of government in the world.

For three or four years nothing had been said on this financial question, and a great many people thought that because they had been silent the question was dead. But that was not so, for it was very much alive, and the only possible way to kill it was by dealing with it. The form of the debate that day was different to what it was in the past. Generally speaking, Irish Members had been induced to allow the Budget to go through upon being promised a day for an academic discussion of this question. A change had now been made by which Great Britain got two-thirds of the time allotted for this question, and one-third was given to Ireland. He hoped the Chancellor of the Exchequer would try to treat this question seriously, for he was Chancellor of the Exchequer for Ireland as well as for Great Britain, and he occupied that position in a separate capacity. At the time of the Union there was a separate Irish Chancellor, but when he was abolished there was an understanding that the British Chancellor should do justice to Ireland. They had now a new Chancellor of the Exchequer, and he trusted he would be able to say something reassuring. They had not got the figures upon this question, and those quoted by his hon. friend stopped at the year 1902. He thought this was a little hard, because when they were dealing with Great Britain they were furnished with the figures for the present year. They were now dealing with the vital affairs of a nation and the absence of those figures gave a sort of unreality to the whole business. The Chancellor of the Exchequer might easily tell them how his proposed taxation would fall upon Ireland just as he had done in the case of Great Britain.

There had been an interval of three years since this subject was discussed, and an interval of ten years since the Royal Commission met. What had happened in the interval? Great Britain had been through a war, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer would probably tell him that the taxes had been imposed on account of the necessities of that war. There were two other great wars during the 100 years of the Union, and no doubt he would say the same thing as his predecessors said after the Crimean War and after the Battle of Waterloo, that for various reasons the war taxation could not be reduced. In the present instance it had not been reduced in England. But the case of Ireland was not the same as that of England. The latter was a progressive country with a growing population and increasing wealth; whereas Ireland had a diminishing population and no wealth. Yet, although the circumstances were so different, the same system was applied to the two countries. Since this question was last discussed the dream of Imperialism had arisen before the British mind, and a large majority of the House of Commons was pledged to the policy of expansion. The protest against that policy, even on the Opposition side of the House, had been to him rather disappointing. When challenged during recent debates by the Chancellor of the Exchequer to state what items of expenditure they would reduce, the reply of the Liberal leaders had not been very clear. Personally, he had never concealed his views on the matter, and was always ready to go into the division lobby in support of them. As far as Great Britain was concerned, he would reduce expenditure all round—on the Civil Service as well as on the Army and Navy. The policy of Imperialism required money, and the extra funds necessitated by this purely British dream were being dragged out of poor starving Ireland. It was a gross injustice. The Navy, the greatest branch of our extravagance, was said to exist for the purpose of protecting the vast commerce of the country. But Ireland had no commerce, and therefore did not need the protection, but still her declining population of peasants had to pay for the insurance of the commerce of the richest nation in the world. Looked at from that point of view, it was singularly unjust that so large a proportion of the increased taxation should be dragged out of Ireland. Another point that should not be lost sight of was that, whereas the expenditure had increased by £50,000,000 during the last ten years, £40,000,000 was spent on the Army and Navy, and the whole of this money was spent in Great Britain. Although the Irish situation would not be relieved by a portion of the money being spent in Ireland, he thought it was a fact that ought to be considered. It was frequently said that a kindlier feeling was growing up between England and Ireland, but no reflection of that feeling was to be found in the financial policy of the Government.

What were the results that were being achieved by this policy? It used to be the custom to blame the House of Lords for the mis-government of Ireland, but the real seat of oppression was the House of Commons. Irish questions were settled, not by Irish opinion, nor by Irish Members, but by an Assembly in which, to one Irish Member there were five British Members, who knew nothing of the situation, and had not passed through the starvation and ruin which the Irish people had had to endure. Let us look for a moment at the results which had been achieved in this financial department. In 1860, a new chapter in Irish oppression was opened, and what had Great Britain got out of it? The taxation of Ireland was doubled during ten years, and according to a Treasury Return, Great Britain got an Imperial contribution of £5,400,000. At first, therefore, the oppression paid. But ten years later the contribution had fallen to £4,400,000; in 1880, it was £3,200,000; in 1890, it was £2,600,000; and in 1900, it was only £1,600,000. Why had the contribution so diminished? Because, as the patient bled to death, expensive restoratives had had to be applied, and the cost of governing Ireland had continually increased as new exactions were made. The hon. Member for Dublin had pointed out that the Imperial contribution had increased during the last four years by £1,000,000. But that £1,000,000 had been secured only by increasing the taxation of Ireland by £2,000,000, the other £1,000,000 being to a large extent wasted. The only other fact needed to fill in the miserable story was that since 1860 the population had diminished from 6,000,000 to 4,400,000. Thus there was the awful tragedy, probably unparalleled in history, certainly unequalled in the present day, of a country with a constantly decreasing population having to pay constantly increasing taxation. The profit of the policy was small, and showed a tendency to diminish. But if the results to Great Britain were bad, to Ireland they were simply ruinous. Irish ports were crowded, as they had been for fifty years past, with emigrants hurrying away from the tyranny enforced of this House, but the people who remained, instead of being better off, were more miserable than before. In Great Britain pauperism had halved; but in Ireland it had doubled. There was a complete stagnation of industry in the country. Why should the House of Commons take so much interest in the Transvaal and West Africa and so little in Ireland? The white population in the Transvaal was only 200,000, and in West Africa it was probably under 20,000; ought not a little consideration to be given to the 4,400,000 in Ireland?

There was also the unconstitutional aspect of the question. Irish Unionists sympathised with Nationalists on the question of taxation, and yet, although Irish opinion was practically unanimous, it was powerless to effect the slightest alteration. Surely the cry of a united people ought to be listened to by the House of Commons; or the responsibility of refusing such an appeal when made would be extremely grave. Would the Chancellor of the Exchequer say what he would like to have the Irish Members do which they had not done in this matter? They had convinced their own country—they would never convince this—they had been patient, a tribunal had considered the question, and judgment had been pronounced in their favour. What more were they to do? What recourse was left open to Ireland if the demands of the Irish Members were so constantly neglected in the way they had been for the last 100 years.

He might be asked to state what the remedy was. In his opinion the remedy was that Ireland should be allowed to take full charge of her own financial matters. Ireland was the only part of the Empire outside Great Britain in which Great Britain interfered in financial matters. We did not interfere in the Isle of Man or in the Channel Islands nor in any colony as we did in Ireland, and what was the result? Those communities prospered, while Ireland was ruined. The treatment meted out to Ireland was the exception to that meted out to other parts of the Empire, There was no question of religion or of race involved in the matter because all classes alike supported it. We should give to Ireland financial autonomy, subject to her paying a proper contribution for a fixed period—say seven years. Let the finances be left in her own hands. What was the use of the Irish being economical; they derived no benefit from any economy, it only went to swell their contribution. Switzerland flourished because of the cheap and economical government of the country. Ireland failed because of the extravagance of its government. He denied that there would be any difficulty in setting up a Customs House for Ireland. He saw no difficulty whatever for the reason that so few articles affecting this country would be touched. The matters to which attention had been drawn were very grave, and it was unfortunate that more British Members of the House were not present to consider them. The Chancellor of the Exchequer in picking out tea for an increased duty had picked out an article which hit Ireland far harder than Great Britain. One-seventh of the revenue derived from this tax would come from Ireland, instead of one-twentieth, which was all to which the Exchequer was entitled. The right hon. Gentleman got one-seventh from this poor country, which had not one-seventh of the population of this country nor one-seventieth of its prosperity. That was the system which had been adopted towards Ireland throughout the past century and he thought the right hon. Gentleman now, on behalf of the Government, should at least order some large inquiry into the matter, in order to discover a remedy for it. In his opinion, the Irish representatives were well entitled to bring the matter forward.

Mr. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.) said that now the question of Irish land was in a fair way of settlement he thought this was by far the most important of the Irish questions which the House could discuss. The House had been listening during the past few days to the complaints of English Members as to the general expenditure. If the representatives of a rich country like England were crying out against expenditure, surely the representatives of a poor country like Ireland had a double right to do the same thing. What was the case of Ireland in this matter? The population of Ireland was a diminishing one, and not only that, if hon. Members looked into the Emigration Returns they would find that the very best of the population was leaving the country. He was curious to look at the ages of emigrants, and he found that the overwhelming majority of the people who had left Ireland during the last twelve months were men and women between the ages of seventeen and thirty years. The country was being bled to death. A people passionately attached to their native land, as the Irish people were, did not leave it without cause, and it was the duty of this country to investigate the cause and try to bring about a remedy for this state of things. There was thus a diminishing population, and the people that were left, instead of getting richer, were getting poorer. The pauperism of Ireland a few years ago was at the rate of eleven per 1,000; at the present time it was twenty-two per 1,000. The pauperism of England was steadily diminishing; that of Ireland was steadily increasing. It was the duty of the Government to go to the root of the matter, and see what it really meant. While in Ireland the population was diminishing and pauperism was increasing, the taxation was going steadily on. Surely that was a good case at least for inquiry. He thought an inquiry absolutely necessary.

What was the case of England as against that? Every year this subject of the financial relations was discussed; the same statement was made that the matter was all settled in 1819, when the principle of indiscriminate taxation was adopted, that the people of Ireland were not taxed any more heavily than the people of England; and that if there were poor in Ireland then there were also poor in England. That was the English case as set forth from the Treasury Bench upon every occasion that this question was raised. Then, in addition to that, they told the Irish people to look at the set-off, and said it was true that Ireland paid £10,000,000 of general revenue per annum, but what was expended in Ireland must be considered. It was the question of the set-off that he wished to touch upon; and the first thing he wished to point out was that nobody in Ireland under the present system had the slightest interest in economy at all. "The more money spent in Ireland the better," was what the people argued. One gentleman to whom he spoke on the subject said his great complaint was that the Government were reducing the constabulary, which was one of the only professions left in Ireland. The Irish people had got into the way of thinking that the spending of money was to the advantage of Ireland, but they seemed to be ignorant of the fact that the money spent came from Ireland itself, not from England. He had looked into the Appropriation Accounts and had endeavoured to compare Ireland with Scotland. Ireland was a poor country, Scotland a rich country; Ireland had no mineral resources, Scotland great mineral wealth. For the three items Supreme Court of Judicature, County Courts, and law charges, not including the Irish Land Commission, Ireland paid £421,687 last year, while Scotland paid only £259,373. There was more crime in Scotland than in Ireland. Ireland was absolutely a crimeless country, because agrarian crime had practically disappeared. Notwithstanding these facts that Scotland had far more crime and law business than Ireland, it managed to conduct all its legal business for so much less. What did it all mean? Scotland and Ireland had equal populations. Everybody who knew Ireland and Dublin knew perfectly well that the business of the country could be effectually done by half the number of Judges in the High Court. As to the County Court Judges, there could be no doubt that counties could be amalgamated for this purpose, and at least the services of a quarter of the County Court Judges could be dispensed with. Nobody, however, had the slightest interest in promoting economy, because Ireland would not get the benefit of it. The Local Government Board in Ireland cost £79,875 per annum, in Scotland it only cost £15,825. He had never heard that the local government business of Scotland was ineffectively conducted; it was probably better conducted than that of Ireland. This was, therefore, a very striking difference. The money was all spent on officials of one kind or another. Nobody had any interest in reducing the number of these, because Ireland would not get the benefit of the reduction; it would go to swell the Imperial *quota.* Take the Registrar-General's Department in Ireland. That cost £22,913. The same Department in Scotland cost £12,239. The Valuation Department cost £32,000 in Ireland. There was no such Department in Scotland or England, as the work was done by local assessment committees without any charge at all. The office of the Secretary of State for Scotland cost exactly the same amount as the Chief Secretary's office in Ireland, the cost in the case of Ireland being £41,650, and in the case of Scotland £41,678. But a still more flagrant matter was the case of the police. Ireland, which was actually devoid of crime, was governed by a gigantic system of police, who had nothing to do. What was the position of agrarian crime? The Chief Secretary had actually given notice that he was no longer going to publish the quarterly Returns, for they were not required. The legislation passed by the House had told upon the land question, and agrarian crime had disappeared. There were about half-a-dozen black spots kept black by landlordism and nothing else, but for all practical purposes agrarian crime had disappeared. There was very little ordinary crime. Yet the cost of the Royal Irish Constabulary for the year came to £1,412,429. Add the sum of £156,785 for the Dublin Metropolitan Police, and they got a total of £1,569,214 for policing a practically crimeless country. Ireland was not a country of large towns. It was not a country where there was great mining or anything of the kind. But Scotland had large centres of population, and everybody knew that large centres tended to breed crime. Well, the police cost in Ireland £1,569,214, and, according to the local taxation account for Scotland, Scotland was policed last year for £529,116. Was this not a monstrous state of affairs? Surely a Government that was responsible for the government of Ireland ought to face these facts. The least that could be done was that there should be an inquiry.

The hon. Member for the St. Stephen's Green Division of Dublin—his own representative in that House—made a most admirable speech, and certainly the hon. Member was a distinct acquisition to Irish debates so far as finance was concerned. Supposing the Chancellor of the Exchequer, convinced that a case had been made out for inquiry, came to the conclusion that really this House could not settle this Irish difficulty of finance. So far as Englishmen and Scotchmen were concerned, they showed no interest whatever in this question. Why should they not have what the hon. Member for Islington called financial autonomy in Ireland? They had financial autonomy seventeen years after the Union, and therefore the question of the Union and separation could not be raised. If they could have a separate Irish Exchequer and financial autonomy with a reasonable amount fixed for the Imperial *quota*—he did not indicate the amount, but it should take into account the condition of Ireland and Great Britain—and fixed on the Scotch basis, they would be able to save, according to the figures which had been given, at least £2,000,000 sterling per annum, and nobody would be a bit the worse but everybody would be better off. Why should this not be done? Look at the state of the House of Commons at the present moment. Where were the Ulster Unionist Members? If there was a Coercion Act to be maintained they would all be there fighting like grim death. If there was anything to crush individual Irishmen down they were always on the spot and on the job. Where were they to-night, when this question which was crushing the life out of their constituencies was being discussed? Why were they not there to impress upon the Government the necessity for action? [A NATIONALIST MEMBER: Because Moore wants a job.] Everybody in Ireland wanted a job. That was the crying curse of the whole thing. If they took thirty men out of the Library of the Four Courts they would find that all the rest were there in the sure and certain hope of something turning up, or they would not be there at all. The whole thing was done in jobs in Ireland, and the sooner it was brought to an end the better. He did not in the least doubt the good intentions of the Chief Secretary in this matter. He was perfectly persuaded that he knew that things could not go on as they were. Did anybody imagine that he did not know all about "jobs"? He knew a great deal better than many hon. Members. He thought it was a reasonable proposition which had been put before the House by the hon. Member for Islington. There ought to be an inquiry into the taxable capacity of Ireland and into the question of a set-off and how far it affected the Irish people. If that inquiry was granted it would produce a great benefit for Ireland.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.) thought it was very unfair of the hon. Member for South Tyrone to quarrel with the Ulster Members. Did he not know that the Chief Secretary had given notice that he intended to reduce the number of Judges and reduce the salary of the Lord Chancellor of Ireland? The Unionist Members were now considering that proposal, and unless they could get a proper assurance on the subject, they might vote against the Government to-night. Just as on the University question, if Dr. Traill had not been appointed Provost of Trinity College the Irish Unionist Members would have voted against the Government on Chinese labour. That was how Government majorities were made up. He intended to support this proposal to reduce the number of Judges and the salary of the Lord Chancellor in Ireland, for anything calculated to turn the denizens of the Library of the Four Courts into a Ribbon lodge was known to make Unionists and Loyalists in Ireland absolutely discontented, and therefore he should give the measure his cordial support. He did not believe that when the measure had been passed there would be one intelligent supporter of the Government left in Dublin. The hon. Member had asked why they could not have financial autonomy in Ireland, and he had told the House that in 1817 they had a separate Chancellor of the Exchequer. On looking in the *Dublin Gazette* about six or eight months ago, just after the financial rumpus in the Cabinet and the changes in the Ministry, he was greatly surprised to find that Ireland still had a Chancellor of the Exchequer, and the name given was "Mr. Austen Chamberlain." He confessed that he never had such a shock in his life, and he asked himself at once, "Why am I not the Mayor of Birmingham?" He possessed all the qualifications for that office, for he was only in Birmingham once, and then only for a single night. He knew nothing whatever of Birmingham or its finances or its debt, he cared nothing about its people or whether its industries went up or down, or whether its guns were no longer what they were. Accordingly, he had every qualification for being placed in charge of Birmingham. The right hon. Gentleman was Chancellor of the Exchequer for Ireland, and they went through the tragic farce of appealing to him on that occasion, as they had appealed to his predecessors for the last quarter of a century. Every one of them knew that if the right hon. Gentleman was to listen to their arguments he would not be allowed to hold office for long, and if he were to make a sympathetic speech about Ireland, or to agree that Ireland was over-taxed, his colleagues in the Cabinet would fire him out. It would not be the right hon. Gentleman's fault, but he would that night repeat the speech which the Treasury had prepared for eight or nine of his predecessors, whom he had heard deliver it in that House. It was part of the farce of Irish representation in that House, and it ought to be put an end to.

What Ireland wanted in the first place was a Government. He did not care whether it was an Orange Government or what sort of a Government. It wanted an Irish Government. It wanted some man in Dublin who would keep a diary, a ledger, and a profit-and-loss account, and would see that Ireland was fairly treated. How could they expect the right hon. Gentleman to do anything? He (Mr. Healy) knew nothing about England, though he had lived there off and on for thirty years. And what could they expect him to know? When the right hon. Gentleman was Secretary to the Treasury there was a little Bill called the Derry Central Railway (Ireland) Bill. The Government had lent it some money; he (Mr. Healy) did not know what the figures were, but he would suppose it was £100,000. The railway was worth £300,000. The Government could not get their money. The little railway was not paying. Accordingly the Treasury sold the whole thing to the Belfast and Northern Counties Railway Company. He said "You ought not to destroy the chance of competition. You ought to dandle these little railways on the knees of the Treasury." The railway had hardly been sold, thereby confiscating £300,000 or £400,000 of these people's money, than the Belfast and Northern Counties Railway sold it, stock, lock, and barrel, to the Midland Railway. That was what came of these petty Treasury manœuvres, and the right hon. Gentleman was as unconscious that he was doing Ireland any wrong, as he was unconscious to-day, he himself was satisfied, that the English connection was doing Ireland any harm in Ireland. He was much in this House in what he would call his Radical days. He used to think that Ireland was misgoverned by England out of a spirit of malignity. It was nothing of the kind. The English did not hate the Irish. He wished the Irish could return the compliment. They were simply absolutely indifferent, and they were satisfied in their smug self-satisfaction that anything they had done must be right, and that it was the privilege of the Irish to grumble at it. Now he had sadly come to the conclusion that it was almost beyond the wit of one Parliament, one statesman, or even one generation to undo the misfortune of their system in Ireland. It had taken the English 730 years to fasten themselves upon the country in the way they had done. There was no power in that House to a large extent to undo it. If they did it in that House by some great political cataclysm, such as Mr. Gladstone tried to organise, it would be put an end to in the House of Lords. They had no Government now. What had happened? Some Englishmen were discontented, and he saw a grumble in *The Times* newspaper because His Majesty the King made some speeches in Ireland. His Majesty was lectured by *The Times* for having been civil to the Irish people. Why did the Irish people receive the King? Because they thought he was a King, and because they thought he could do something for them. *The Times* pointed out their delusion, and said he could do nothing for them, because he was entirely in the hands of Ministers. When the Irish made a treaty with the British they never accepted the British Constitution. Government by a king in Ireland would be far preferable to government by Parliament. Government by Parliament in Ireland was a curse. They could get nothing out of Parliament. The Irish Members came to the House year after year. From time to time there were new Chief Secretaries. He had seen a score of them. His hon. friend the Member for Dublin said, "Send us Lord Cromer." Why! he, himself, would welcome Lord Milner. He would welcome a potentate from Japan. But give them government by the Irish, whether Orangeman or Papist, Unionist or Nationalist. Give them something in the country that would work.

It was said they had a Chief Secretary for Ireland. He was amusing himself while the debate was going on in trying to find out whether they had a Chief Secretary or not. What was the Chief Secretary to-day in Ireland? Absolutely nothing. Let them take the clock and divide it into twelfths, the whole clock representing Ireland. Over how much of the area of that clock had the Chief Secretary any power? The first five minutes represented, let him say, the Army. Had he any power to move a single soldier or to make barracks? No; he had nothing to do with the Army. Let them take the next five minutes—that represented the Navy. What had the Chief Secretary got to do with the Navy? He could neither appoint nor dismiss a coastguard. He had nothing to do with the Navy. Then as to the next five-minutes. Had he got anything to do with the revenue in Ireland? No; the revenue officers were independent of him. He could not appoint a man of them. The next five minutes represented the Inland Revenue, a most important Department, because they had officers all over the country making the most important decisions affecting Irish land. The other day they decided that when a man sold his farm he should pay stamp duty. He became a peasant proprietor, having to pay his instalments for the next seventy years to the Government. The tenant-right would be perhaps £100 or £200, and would be satisfied by a 10s. stamp duty. But the Inland Revenue said when he sold his little patch of land he would be compelled to pay, instead of 10s., a stamp duty of £5. Could the Chief Secretary alter that? Nothing of the kind. The next five minutes he would devote to the Post Office and its army officials. The other day there was a great row in his constituency in Dundalk. The people there said to him—"When you became Member for Dundalk we had an Irish postmaster, and out of fourteen or fifteen officials there were ten or eleven Catholics." Now in Dundalk the last postmaster was an Englishman, and he had changed the Catholic officials, so that instead of the proportion being ten or eleven Catholics to three Protestants, it was the other way about. That was because they appointed a man at Dundalk who was brought from Plymouth or Birmingham or some English town. So it was all over the country. Every little office was given to some Englishman or Scotsman who was imported. He only wished the Chief Secretary would lay down for his British colleagues the law or rule which the Lord-Lieutenant in a most admirable letter laid down the other day to the Galway County Council when they appointed a Catholic doctor to the lunatic asylum board. The Lord-Lieutenant said that promotion in those cases should go by seniority. The Irish members whether in connection with the Post Office, Inland Revenue, or any of the other Boards were always told that seniority was beside the question, and that the real thing was that the best man should be selected for the office. He came now to the next five minutes. Where was the Treasury in Ireland? Why, the Chief Secretary lived in a house and in a park over which he had not the smallest control. It was governed for him by what was called the Board of Works and every member of the Board of Works was appointed from London. Two out of the three at the present moment were Englishmen and the third was brother of the Treasury Remembrancer. He had heard from former Chief Secretaries that if the Chief Secretary for Ireland cut a peach or a bunch of grapes in his own garden he was debited with it. He did not know whether that was true; but the right hon. Gentleman did not deny it. Fancy a country like that. Fancy the Chief Secretary of the country having no power over his conservatory, which was managed from London by the Board of Works. Then the next five minutes represented the Board of Trade. All their railways, all their canals and all their tramways were managed for them from London. When they had an inquiry in Dublin as to whether a tramway was going ten or eleven miles an hour, the Government officials brought a man from London to decide it, and he brought a Birmingham speed indicator in his pocket. This grievance affected the railways themselves. When a great accident took place in this country more precautions for passengers were ordered to be introduced. It was proper that the London and North Western Railway Company should adopt special methods for the safety of the travelling public, but in a go-as-you-please country like Ireland these were not matters for the Board of Trade at all. The other day there was a dispute on the Kingstown Line as to whether the Kingstown Company was to pay a certain rent to the Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Company, and they had a great meeting in their board-room and the thing was solemnly decided in this way. "Resolved that under our Act which we got last year, we sever connection with the Kingstown Company and we appoint the Board of Trade to act as arbitrator between the two bodies." That was what the English system had brought the country to. Two small Irish railway companies invoked, in regard to this arbitration, the Board of Trade, although no Englishman practically knew a tithe as much about the matter as the ordinary inhabitant of Dublin. Then there was the Woods and Forests. In buying a foreshore property or a pier it was necessary to apply to the Woods and Forests, and strange to say any money that was contributed in Ireland to the Royal Revenue was invested in England in purely English securities for the benefit of the Royal family, so that the Irish quit rents were withdrawn from Ireland *in globo* year after year. What remained? The right hon. Gentleman could appoint a policeman, could direct prosecutions, and the way in which many of the prosecutions had been made had been demonstrated by the fact that the Crown prosecutor had prosecuted a Scotch sailor for marrying his mother-in-law. It was only in Ireland that jokes of that kind could be perpetrated.

With regard to the set-off he should like to make a suggestion. The question of home manufactures was agitating Parliament; he would point out that the handcuffs at present used in Ireland were made in Germany, that the batons with which police struck Irish heads were imported from Norway. Could they not make a beginning with Irish industries and make them at home? He had spent some years of effort in the House trying to have the Royal Irish Constabulary and coastguard uniforms made in Ireland, and he had never till then realised the cunning of the contract system—he did not blame the Englishmen—he dared say Irishmen would do the same—of the way they managed to put Ireland out of a share in these contracts. The Prime Minister was sympathetic, but he was also absolutely paralysed! He said that the Treasury insisted that indigo was the best dye for stuffs of this class. Now, all new industries connected with fabrics of that kind used chemical dyes, and it did not pay manufacturers to dye their stuffs with indigo. It did not pay any manufacturer in Ireland now to put down an indigo dyeing plant, and consequently only some four or five English manufacturers were able to comply with the Government specification. Irish Members were allowed three out of the twenty-one allotted days in Supply. Accepting that proportion there ought to be £20,000,000 of expenditure in Ireland. Instead of that they got practically no expenditure. Actually the other day the merchant tailors of Dublin met in a body to protest against the fact that the War Office were secretly sending out circulars ordering young subalterns to order their clothing from houses in London. The matter was raised in that House, and answered with some of the usual official lies. They said that the adjutant's lette of instruction was not official, that the War Office knew nothing about it. It was like when a landlord in Ireland had to be shot. Nobody ever knew anything at all. The "hard word" was passed; and the Irish uniform trade was practically killed because the War Office knew nothing whatever about it. The hon. Member for West Bristol used to ask why

Lord Iveagh should not pay income-tax just as Lord Rothschild did. But he never contracted to pay it. If they had no income-tax in Ireland, Irish families instead of going to the Channel Islands and places in France where they could live cheaply—even Irish landlords—would be induced to stay at home. It was easier for a man with an income of £5,000 to pay a 1s. 3d. income-tax, than it was for a man with an income of £500, consequently the poor country was much harder hit than the rich one.

They were told that if they gave up drinking whisky their grievance would disappear. But what would happen if they gave up drinking whisky. There would be a tax on salt. The mild Hindoo did not drink whisky, but he ate salt and could not get on without it, and so his salt was taxed. If the Irish ate or drank stirabout it would be taxed. They were in the position of having no Government to deal with but a series of changing and fluctuating officials passing along that Bench opposite like shadows. What between the Rules of the House, the existence of the House of Lords, want of time, and indifference, they were powerless to do anything, and so year after year, and generation after generation, they had this Irish exodus and this misery going on, and practically without any benefit to England. They told the mountaineer and hillside man of Ireland to think Imperially, and consoled him with the reflection that his money was going for hunting the Mad Mullah in Somaliland, and told him the flag was waving high at Lhasa or Gyangtse. These were the prospects held out to the Celtic imagination. He wondered they did not send lantern slides of the Mullah hunt to comfort the Irish people. Could any man on that Front Bench bring a conscientious investigation to the subject? Not a man thought it worth while to study it as they did the case of 200,000 white men in the Transvaal. It was not a reduction of Irish Members that was wanted but their abolition; and the abolition of the rule in Ireland of this Parliament; and if they were not to have a Parliament of their own set up, at any rate let them have some system of government which would be Irish in thought and spirit.

Mr. T. M. Healy.

Mr. POWER (Waterford, E.) said that they could not speak of Ireland in this connection without alluding to the poverty which undoubtedly existed in that country. The House must bear in mind that in considering any financial question they were on the one hand considering the finances of one of the richest countries in the world, and on the other they were considering the finances of one of the poorest countries in the world. It was no consolation to Irish Members to know that there was a great deal of poverty in England. The poverty which existed in Ireland was the direct result of the government of Ireland by this House. He quite agreed with the hon. Member for North Dublin that it did not require statistics to prove the difference between the conditions which existed in England and in Ireland. In England, no doubt, there was a great deal of poverty in some of the large towns, but a great deal of that poverty pertained to the Irish population. But who was responsible for that? The English Government did not educate the Irish youth properly, and they were compelled to come over to this country and compete with English labour; and consequently Irish Members held England responsible for the great deal of poverty that existed in these English towns. It was true that poverty existed in this country, but it was not so noticeable beside the immense prosperity to be witnessed on all sides. Anyone who crossed the Channel to Ireland would find a transformation scene of the most hideous description, for there they would see decay and people flying from the land. However they looked at the connection of Ireland with this country, they would find that it had been fruitful of nothing but disaster. Take the last twenty-five years—they had had a great famine where over 1,250,000 people died of starvation, and in 1880 there was another famine averted only by the charity of the world. Other comparative famines followed in 1886, in 1892, and in 1896. On the last occasion of the famine in 1896 they were told that there was no necessity for anything to be done, but one month after that statement the Government were compelled to institute relief works in the West of Ireland, and they paid the magnificent wages of 6s.

per week, and at those starvation wages large bodies of able-bodied men were prepared to work. A greater proof of poverty than that could not be found. Local and Imperial taxation was increasing in Ireland at an extraordinary rate, whilst the population was decreasing. As had been pointed out by the hon. Member for South Tyrone, a large percentage of those left in Ireland were old men and women and young children, because the people who ought to be the mainstay of the country had emigrated.

When the Union was established, one of the great advantages claimed for it was the beneficial financial effects which would flow from it. That prediction had been falsified, and those who predicted ruin had proved to be correct. Mr. Curran once said that the Union would mean the emigration of every man of consequence in Ireland, and simply the participation of Irishmen in British taxes without British trade. Time had since shown that they had participated to the full in the taxes and no increase in trade had taken place. Again, Mr. Curran said that their scanty means had been squandered as profusely as their best blood had been wasted in the madness of England's aggression. There again his words had proved true, for had not the South African war thrown enormous burdens upon Ireland? and some of the best blood of Ireland had been spilt in South Africa. Between the years 1851 and 1884 no less than £28,000,000 were sent to Ireland from the United States, including South America, and excluding Australia and elsewhere. But without that vast sum of money from the United States the condition of Ireland would have been very much worse. Again and again they had brought forward this question of over-taxation with little or no effect. He wished to join in paying his tribute to his hon. friend the Member for St. Stephen's Division for the masterly statement he had placed before the House, although he was not very sanguine that it would have very much effect upon the decision of the House. Some time ago an equally able statement was made by his hon. friend the Member for Longford, and no step whatsoever was taken to rectify in the least the case which he made out, and which as a matter of fact was unanswerable. He would not go over the ground which had been traversed by his hon. friend, but he wished to read to the House a quotation which appeared in the Report of the Committee of 1865, which was drawn up by Sir Stafford Northcote, and which inquired into this subject. Sir Stafford Northcote quoted the evidence of a witness named Senior, who said—

> "The taxation of England was both the heaviest and the lightest in Europe, the heaviest as regards the amount raised and the lightest as regards the ability to bear that amount. Perhaps in the case of Ireland it is heavy both as regards the amount and as regards the ability to contribute. England is the most lightly taxed and Ireland the heaviest, though both are nominally liable to equal taxation. I do not believe that Ireland is a poor country because she is over-taxed, but I think she is over-taxed because she is poor."

What would be the result of this debate He was not very sanguine about anything tangible being done for Ireland, and he thought they had great reason to complain of the way in which the decisions of the Royal Commission had been treated. He had heard some suggestions that afternoon as to further inquiries being necessary on this subject. As far as his own humble judgment was concerned, he thought the Government had plenty of information before them, for they had had inquiry after inquiry and if they wished to do justice they had plenty of *data* at their disposal. What was their complaint? The Royal Commission recommended that Ireland should not be called upon to pay more than one-twentieth of the taxation of Great Britain. For the sake of unanimity that decision was arrived at. But many of those who signed that Report believed that far from being able to bear a proportion of one-twentieth, Ireland was not actually able to bear more than one-forty-sixth of the total taxation. That Commission was composed of Englishmen principally, and when the Repo t first appeared there was an inclination on the part of English Members to ridicule that Commission and its findings; but so overwhelming was the evidence produced, that they issued this Report in which they stated that, according to their opinion, Ireland was overtaxed to the extent of £3,000,000 a year. What had been done to remedy that? Here was a Commission appointed to inquire fairly and squarely into the financial condition of the two countries, and they found a verdict. What was the Government going to do with that verdict? Were they going to give effect to it? Not at all, it was to be a dead letter because the verdict was against this country. He would like to know what would have been the result if the verdict had been the other way. Had the Commission said Ireland was under-taxed, within twelve months another tax would have been clapped on, and because Irish representatives called attention to these things they were said to be always cavilling. He was not surprised at the action the Government took, because Ireland had never been granted anything except as the result of considerable and long-sustained agitation, and until this matter was brought home to the Government in a very forcible manner there would be no redress. The treatment of Ireland in this respect was characteristic of the treatment of Ireland all through by this country.

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL (Oldham) said that everyone must realise the undoubted difficulties presented by the association of a poor country with a prosperous, ambitious, world Power like England. The Amendment had an important bearing upon the whole question of expenditure. After reading the Report of the Financial Relations Commission, no one could deny that a strong case was made out in almost every page, and that everything in it tended to be progressively aggravated by every increase in the general rate of expenditure throughout the country. He believed that it was a fact that the cost of Irish government was greater in proportion to the area of the country than any similar national area. No doubt a great disparity existed between the cost of the services in Ireland and Scotland. He should like, however, to see a Return presented to that House, so that they might be able to discover the true relationship between the cost of the two administrations. He ventured to think that some curious anomalies would be revealed. He had been much impressed with the high salaries of the Irish law officers. The Lord Chancellor, for instance, had £8,000 a year salary with £4,000 a year pension. That was the scale under which Lord Ashbourne was remunerated for taking part in the deliberations of the British Cabinet.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Is the hon. Gentleman aware that £3,000 of that is for performing his duties as Speaker of the Irish House of Lords?

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL would be sorry to say that Lord Ashbourne had not as good a claim in respect of that important office as in respect of any other duties he performed. That salaries of this scale should be paid was a hideous anomaly when they reflected that it was quite impossible for anyone to earn at the Irish Bar (so he was told) anything like a sum approaching £8,000.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: Not one half.

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL: They knew how difficult it was to keep down expense in this country, but in Ireland it was only natural that the whole spirit and sentiment of the people and of the Government and the officials themselves should be exerted in favour of multiplying offices, keeping up salaries, and generally increasing the cost of administration. Irishmen knew that any economy they might make in internal administration only went to swell the Imperial Exchequer, which might be used, and very often was used, for purposes from which the representatives of Ireland totally and completely dissented. It was evident from the Report of the Committee that sat on National Expenditure that the control of the Treasury was much more likely to be effective against new proposals for expenditure than against old continuing items. As he listened to the debate he said to himself, "Thank God we have no financial relations with our Colonies." This money question was the root of all the existing bitterness. The discontent that prevailed between England and Ireland arose not so much from differences of religion and race as from the belief that the English connection was not a profitable nor paying one. If Ireland were more prosperous she would be more loyal, and if more loyal more free. He knew it would be said that this was not the time to forego revenue, but it should be a matter for consideration whether they did not lose in pauperism, in lack of initiative, and social friction more than they obtained by the exertions of the tax collector. He fully admitted that, starting on the basis that Ireland was an integral part of the United Kingdom the case for the Treasury was unanswerable. If they assumed that the area of ground was exactly the same no matter which side of the Channel it was, there was no sort of case which could be presented for the treatment of Ireland as a separate taxable area, but to do that was to ignore all the differences of race, of religion, of interest, of occupation, and of history. If the argument had to be sustained upon the basis that Ireland could only be treated as a mere group of English counties without any individuality or identity, it was absurd and would not bear investigation. It would be hard to increase taxation in Ireland while at the same time it was proposed in some quarters to reduce its representation. The question of a separate Exchequer for Ireland, a fixed Imperial contribution, and correspondingly autonomous power to regulate the expenditure of money raised for Irish purposes, was one that could not fail to be brought much nearer the arena of practical politics. In so far as the Irish would lose in Imperial representation in that House they would gain in the same proportion in autonomous authority in their own country, and if any extension of financial autonomy could be made it should be carefully made to the Irish people as a whole, and not to the particular section who happened to support a Conservative Government. These were doubtless problems which would not concern the present Parliament, but the steady rise in the general expenditure of the country, and the distressing effects which high taxation undoubtedly caused to the Irish people, brought these problems much nearer to practical politics, and they would have to be dealt with by those who sat on the right of the Speaker after the next general election.

MR. FLYNN (Cork County, N.) said the hon. Member for North Dublin had brought out two striking facts—first, that the grievance recognised by the Royal Commission in 1894 had been intensified in the years that had since elapsed and, secondly, that although Ireland contributed considerably more than she did ten years ago, her proportionate contribution was smaller. He hoped the Chancellor of the Exchequer would not follow the somewhat ungenerous example set by his predecessors of making light of the Royal Commission. That Commission might appear to have been appointed *ad hoc* in connection with the Home Rule Bill, but though its Report was strong, the official facts and figures were even stronger. The Commission reported in 1896 that Ireland was contributing about one-eleventh of the total revenue. The amount then drawn from Great Britain was £75,796,000 and from Ireland £7,568,649, or 9·08 per cent. In 1899–1900 the revenue drawn from Great Britain was £117,385,000, and from Ireland £8,664,000, a percentage of 7·38, or less than one-thirteenth of the total. In 1902–3 the total expenditure had risen to £146,000,000, towards which Ireland contributed £10,205,000, a percentage of 6·98, or less than one-fifteenth. Thus there was the strange anomaly that while Ireland paid more and more her grievance seemed to diminish. She was now paying £3,000,000 more than ten years ago, and yet her proportionate contribution was smaller. Under the new system an effort was being made to reduce the extravagant expenditure in Ireland, but it should never be forgotten that extravagant expenditure was no justification for excessive taxation. To put the matter in another way, the revenue drawn from Ireland ten years ago amounted to £1 8s. 10d. per head of the population; six years later it was £1 18s. 2d; in 1902-3 it was £2 6s. 1d; and for the current year it would be about £2 16s. Against that might be set the condition in Denmark, a country in keen competition with Ireland. There was a population of 2,465,000, the revenue was £4,209,000, or only £1 14s. per head. Under these circumstances, it could not be considered surprising that Irish representatives should persist in calling attention to the disastrous financial relations between Great Britain and Ireland. As the Chancellor of the Exchequer would doubtless adduce the old argument that the same kind of taxes were levied in Ireland as in Great Britain, it might be useful to remember that, in giving evidence before the Royal Commission on that point, Sir R. Giffen said—

> "The amount contributed by Ireland to the Customs and Excise revenue . . . . is only evidence that in matters of taxation Ireland is virtually discriminated against by the character of the indirect taxes which happen to hit articles of special Irish consumption . . . . It is quite possible for a Government so to adjust its taxes as to take 10 per cent. of the taxable income of one community and 20 per cent. of the taxable income of another community, although the taxes are the same in each case."

Identity of taxation did not necessarily mean equality of burden, as a community could be discriminated against by the selection of the articles upon which a tax was to be levied. For instance, if Great Britain were financially incorporated with France, a tax on wines would hit France very severely while it scarcely touched this country. The question of the financial relations of Ireland had been debated again and again without any beneficial result; once more an unanswerable case had been made out, and doubtless once more it would be ignored.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): Several hon. Members have already presumed that when I came to reply to the various criticisms which have been made I should do little more than repeat the arguments which my predecessors have used on previous occasions. I confess that I do not think I can add very much to the fulness of the information which the House has already in its possession. I might say that by those who have supported the hon. and learned Gentleman who opened the debate, very little has been added of a novel character to the speeches with which the House is familiar. The hon. and learned Member for Louth, in one of those speeches which always delight the House, travelled over a wide field which I thought had very little relevance to the Amendment which would have been moved had it been in order, and to reply to it would carry me far beyond the discussion of the financial relations between the two countries. The main portion of the hon. and learned Gentleman's speech was concerned not so much with the financial relations of the two countries as with the general character of the government of Ireland at the present time. The question of Irish administration, and of the distribution of powers in relation to Irish affairs is scarcely germane to the particular matter before the House with which we are dealing, and that is the financial relations which exist between the two countries, and the contribution which is exacted from Ireland for purposes which are common to the whole of the United Kingdom. I said just now that a greater part of the arguments have travelled over ground familiar to the House, and have not added anything novel to our debate. There has, however, been one speech which, I think, touched something of a new note, and which certainly excited my own interest and that of my right hon. friend the Chief Secretary; I mean the speech of the hon. Member for St. Stephen's. He had some practical proposal to lay before the House. I will refer later on to the points which the hon. Member has raised, but I wish to say now that his speech took a very distinct line from that of the hon. and learned Gentleman who opened the debate and from several of the subsequent speakers. The hon. Gentleman recited facts in relation to Ireland, unfortunately only too true, regarding her economic and social condition, and he spoke of her comparative poverty and the diminution of her population which has been going on from year to year. I know that hon. Gentlemen opposite do not accept this as an answer, but I wish to point out that the facts which the hon. Gentleman related are not peculiar to Ireland. They are common to all those parts of the United Kingdom where the circumstances are similar to those of Ireland; and, as between individuals or classes on the two sides of the Channel, there is no injustice in our present system and there is no tax which bears more hardly on the Irishman than on the Englishman or aggravates conditions in Ireland in a way which is not equally true of those portions of Great Britain where the conditions are similar.

After listening with great attention to the speech of the hon. and learned Gentleman who opened the discussion, I was left without any clear idea of what he thought the financial relations between the two countries ought to be, or whether he was of opinion that Ireland ought to contribute anything to the common expenditure of the United Kingdom. If we extracted wealth from Ireland for our common purposes out of proportion to the wealth of that country, I think the hon. and learned Gentleman would have a very strong case for a revision of our fiscal arrangements. But is that anything like the case? We raise in Ireland a considerable amount of revenue. [AN HON. MEMBER: How much?] As regards the current year I have not the figures, but I will endeavour to get them for the hon. Gentleman. The question is, do we take from Ireland a greater contribution than is, on any possible argument which has been put before the House, an unfair proportion of our common expenditure? The hon. Gentleman looks only to the amount of money raised and refuses to consider the subsequent expenditure of that money.

MR. CLANCY: Oh no, I do not.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I thought the hon. and learned Member brushed aside any argument with reference to the set-off, and argued that we were not entitled to place against the contribution of Ireland the cost of local administration in Ireland.

MR. CLANCY: I hope the House will not take the right hon. Gentleman's account of my argument as correct.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I confess that I had some difficulty in ascertaining what was the line of argument which the hon. and learned Gentleman took up.

MR. CLANCY: The right hon. Gentleman must not take me as assenting to the proposition which he has expressed. I had no proposal to offer for remedying this Irish grievance. I carefully refrained from making any suggestion of the kind for the simple reason that I have no power to carry it out and no responsibility for making any such proposal.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Of course I accept my right hon. and learned friend's account of his speech and his reasons for not putting forward any proposals. I am only anxious to ascertain what is the line of argument which the hon. and learned Gentleman followed, because, after all, it is to the arguments of hon. Gentlemen opposite that I am particularly anxious to address myself, for I do not want to be beating the air, putting forward reasons to which they attach no importance. May I invite the House to consider what has been been the contribution of Ireland for common purposes, say, during the last ten years, and how the expenditure authorised for the purposes of England and Ireland severally has affected that contribution during that time? I am asked to accept the finding of the Royal Commission that the taxable capacity of Ireland is not more than one-twentieth of that of Great Britain, and I assume, as I think I am entitled to assume, that it is fair in the circumstances to say that Ireland may rightfully be asked to contribute not more than one-twentieth of our common expenditure. [AN HON. MEMBER: That was done years ago.] Yes, that was done years ago. To make that contribution to our common expenditure Ireland would have to provide a revenue over and above her expenditure equal to 4·8 per cent. of the total revenue obtainable for Imperial purposes. Ten years ago, in 1893–4, she contributed not 4·8 per cent. but 3·24 per cent. Year by year from that time until the changes in taxation which followed the outbreak of the South African War, the percentage of her contribution steadily diminished. When the new taxes were raised for the war her percentage came in 1902–3, on the old basis of calculation, to 2·66 per cent.—far lower than it was in 1893–4 and lower than, on the basis adopted by the Royal Commission, she could pay. Though I have not received the actual figures for 1903 4, I think I shall be right in saying that on the old basis of calculation Ireland's contribution is 2·50 per cent. But the methods by which these contributions are arrived at are open to considerable doubt, for the statistics for calculation are obtained for a short period and upon imperfect *data*. The calculations are founded on observation of the trade between the two countries during a period of four months. They are taken from four months observation of a portion only of the trade in dutiable goods which passed between Ireland and Great Britain. Of course it is obvious—I am speaking now of indirect taxation—that you cannot merely take the amount of duty paid in Ireland, because a great deal of duty may be paid on goods in London which are subsequently removed for sale and consumption in Ireland, while, on the other hand, a certain amount of duty is paid on articles—tobacco especially—in Ireland, which are subsequently removed for consumption in Great Britain. Accordingly an attempt was made to ascertain the real consumption in each of the two countries; but it has always been felt that the basis of calculation has been formed on too narrow an observation and examination of the facts, and that the results arrived at are not wholly trustworthy or reliable. Last year a serious attempt was made to arrive at more accurate figures, and instead of observations being confined to four months of the year they were extended over the whole twelve months in order to eliminate miscalculations from seasonable movements of trade. The House can readily understand that trade in some dutiable articles is often brisker at one season than another, and precautions were taken to secure as far as possible an accurate account of the revenue produced by indirect taxation in Great Britain and Ireland respectively.

MR. LOUGH: Was this done by the Customs?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: It was done by the Customs with the assistance of railway companies and carriers between the two countries. The result has been to show that the figure which I have given as the proportion of Ireland's contribution to our common expenditure, namely 2·50 is too high. It is now calculated that Ireland contributes £340,000 less than was assumed on the old basis. That, no doubt, is in part due to the lessened population to which the hon. and learned Gentleman and other hon. Gentlemen have referred, but it is partly due to the proportion of Ireland's consumption having been over-calculated on a previous occasion. This over-calculation of consumption in Ireland was especially true in regard to tea, so that the hon. Member for Islington will at least have the consolation of knowing that when he finds himself compelled to oppose the increase of the tea duty the hardship will not fall so specially on the Irish people as he has supposed. The old calculation was that in Ireland the consumption was 8lbs. per head of population, as compared with 6lbs. per head of population in England. It would appear from the further observations which have now been made that the consumption is a little over 6lbs. in both Great Britain and Ireland, slightly less in the latter country. Without pledging myself to their absolute accuracy, the figures in pounds appear to be 6·245 in England and 6·115 in Ireland.

MR. LOUGH: Are these figures a correction of the Treasury Return?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I do not attempt to correct the figures for 1902–3, but I give the figures as nearly as I can for 1903–4, and subject to fuller correction before they are laid before the House in the next Return which will be presented during this session. Of course, the further back we have gone from 1903–4 the less can the figures be compared, for they were calculated on a different basis and did not conform to the existing state of affairs. It would appear that the proportionate contribution of Ireland for 1903–4, instead of being 2·5 is only 2·14. In other words, while Ireland contributed a thirtieth of Great Britain's contribution in 1893–4, she only contributed a forty-sixth of Great Britain's contribution in 1903–4. In 1893–4 the total revenue derived from taxation contributed by the United Kingdom was £96,856,000, and in 1903–4 it was £146,803,000, an increase of nearly £50,000,000. Towards this increase Ireland contributed £2,041,000, or 4 per cent., and Great Britain yielded £47,906,000, or 96 per cent. Turning to the other side of the account and looking at local expenditure, I find that in 1893–94 in the United Kingdom the total amount was £36,221,000. In 1903-4 it was £51,770,000, an increase of £15,549,000. Of this increase there was devoted to Ireland £1,974,000, or more than 12½ per cent, and to Great Britain £13,575,000, or nearly 87½ per cent. The balance of the revenue contributed by the three kingdoms which was available for Imperial expenditure in 1893-94 was £60,634,000, and in 1903-4 it was £95,033,000, an increase of £34,399,000. Towards this increase Great Britain contributed £34,331,000, or practically the whole, and only £68,000 of the annual expenditure had fallen on Ireland. The hon. Members who have spoken, with, I think, perhaps, the single exception of the hon. Member for St. Stephen's Green, have been disposed to repudiate, as far as I could ascertain, Ireland's liability to contribute to Imperial expenditure at all.

MR. LOUGH: I have not done so.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I am not speaking of the hon. Member for Islington, I am speaking rather of the speeches which have come from the Irish Benches in which most of the Members disassociated themselves from all interest in the Empire, or in our common possessions and dependencies, or in the Navy and Army, or in the purposes for which these services are maintained, or in the country's position and power and strength in the world. They are entitled to take that line if they think fit, but they will not expect a Chancellor of the Exchequer——

MR. CLANCY: May I ask to whom the right hon. Gentleman is referring? I never said a word on the subject, nor do I remember that any of my colleagues have done so.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I think the hon. Gentleman is mistaken. I think I heard references in these speeches to the Navy, the Army, and to colonial and foreign policy generally as being matters in which Ireland has no concern, and if these references were not meant to imply what I have stated I do not understand the relevancy of the references in the debate, or why they were introduced except as matters of prejudice.

MR. CLANCY: The right hon. Gentleman must be thinking of some former debate.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I have perhaps paid more attention to the speeches of the hon. Gentleman's colleagues than he has vouchsafed to them. But, however that may be, I am willing to accept the view that I have misunderstood the whole intention of the remarks and that the hon. Member and his friends are willing to accept the obligation of Ireland to contribute her fair share towards the expenditure for the interests of the Empire of which Ireland forms a part. I am delighted to find that they recognise their interest in the Empire. If that be so I need not argue the case further, for the figures I have quoted are sufficient to show that the contribution Ireland makes is not exorbitant, nor, indeed, what she would contribute if the recommendations of the Commission on which so much has been said were carried out.

There is another side of the case which has been put forward by the hon. Member for St. Stephen's Green and emphasised by the hon. Member for South Tyrone and the hon. and learned Member for Louth. It is that I am not entitled to say that Irish expenditure should be used as a set-off against taxation, because that expenditure is extravagant, that salaries are on too lavish a scale, that there are too many paid officials, and because the whole machinery of government in Ireland is far more expensive than is required for her needs or found necessary in other countries similarly situated. Hon. Gentlemen will see at once that anyone speaking from this Bench would be likely rather to welcome than oppose attempts to effect economy. I am very anxious to find matters on which I can retrench and economise, but they warn me that I can hope for no help from them, because they say that Ireland has no interest in such a policy, and that any economies made would go to swell her contribution. Her *quota* is not now as high as the hon. and learned Gentleman for St. Stephen's Green is willing to place it. I am not prepared to accept the proposal that there should be a separate Exchequer for Ireland. I admit that one Budget a year is quite enough for me. The Chief Secretary and myself have done something to meet the criticisms of hon. Gentlemen. We have agreed, as my predecessors have done, that certain economies, if they can be effected, should not be reaped by the Irish Exchequer, but should go to the advantage of Ireland itself. I quite admit that in many respects Irish administration is far too costly. I agree that she has needs which are different from the needs of this country, and that there is no more wasteful system of Irish or British finance than to insist that wherever money is expended on one object in one part of the United Kingdom, an equivalent amount should necessarily be spent on the same object in another part. It often happens that the money is not required in the other part and could be much better spent on a different object. That is the principle on which my right hon. friend proceeded in connection with the Irish development grant, and he proposes to proceed further in respect of the same matter in a Bill which is to be presented to-morrow. I agree, following the example of my predecessors, that any economies which my right hon. friend the Chief Secretary can persuade the House to make in connection with law charges and the cost of the judiciary in Ireland should pass unscathed through the Exchequer and should be devoted to those purposes of development in Ireland which commend themselves to my right hon. friend in consultation with Irish Members of all shades of opinion. I am perfectly prepared to consider further proposals in this direction made to my right hon. friend or to myself direct by hon. Members, in which case I must consult with him, or proposals dealing in the same way with other economies if hon. Gentlemen think they can be secured. I recognise the advantage there is to everybody concerned in engaging the interests of Irishmen themselves in favour of economy, and of securing their assistance in reducing any extravagance or waste.

Mr. LOUGH: Will you fix the contribution?

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I am not quite prepared to do that. It would not be easy to fix a figure which would be generally accepted, and it might easily happen if they did that

a few years hence this figure might give rise to fresh difficulties. But I am prepared while I am responsible to consider any proposals for economies which my right hon. friend can bring forward, in a spirit not, I hope, unfair to Ireland, and remembering always that I am Chancellor of the Exchequer of Ireland as well as of the United Kingdom. It would be a happy day for Ireland and this House if we could devote our attention more constantly and continuously to practical proposals of this kind rather than to debates of a character which are apt to aggravate differences rather than to heal them, and to divide us further instead of uniting us in any useful or common purpose. Each case must be considered on its merits, but I shall not be unfavourably disposed to any proposals which my right hon. friend may make.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR (Liverpool, Scotland) said that he entirely sympathised with the statement with which the right hon. Gentleman began his speech. He was glad to find that the right hon. Gentleman had followed the example of his predecessor in office and of the Chief Secretary in promising to devote to Ireland the savings made in Irish administration. But he scarcely agreed with a single one of the propositions laid down by the right hon. Gentleman. He felt less presumptuous in saying that because he had the support of the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary. The right hon. Gentleman dealt with a paradox, viz., that the gross contribution of Ireland to the Imperial Exchequer had, roughly speaking, increased, and yet the proportion of the contribution of Ireland had considerably decreased. In 1893–4, when this famous Report was issued, the contribution of Ireland was £7,500,000, in 1903 it was £10,250,000; and this year it was £10,300,000, and, therefore, they saw here an increase of the amount taken from Ireland; but the right hon. Gentleman thought that he had answered that fact by his proposition that the contribution of Ireland was getting smaller every year. He was astonished that so acute a gentleman as the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer did not see the inconsistency of that. Therefore, he held that the proposition which the right hon. Gentleman put forward as an answer to the case of Irish Members, was a confirmation of it. He had the Chief Secretary on his side. On 16th March last, the Chief Secretary said, he had heard it said by hon. Members sitting for English constituencies, that, considering the proportionate contribution of Ireland for Imperial purposes, she was not entitled to any exceptional treatment; but that argument would not bear the test of examination. He contended that the allocation of the savings effected in the course of Irish government to Irish purposes was based upon economic facts—upon the fact that Ireland's arrested development was not only an evil for her, but deprived her of all financial elasticity, and it so happened that Ireland's proportionate contribution was smaller than it might otherwise have been. Few people felt that it was possible to differentiate the taxation as between the two countries. If the same taxes were imposed in both countries, Ireland, being the poorer country, would produce a relatively smaller amount for those taxes, if they were maintained unaltered over a period of years, than they would produce in England. Again, if higher taxes were imposed, such as a war tax, the returns for England would quickly respond; but in Ireland they were beginning to reach the danger point at which taxation ought not to be increased. After that, why should he labour in his poor, imperfect language to answer the right hon. Gentleman?

When they were dealing with this financial question he wondered sometimes what was the extraordinary miasma that seemed to come over all Irish discussions in this House. What were the facts? This country was increasing in wealth and in population, Ireland was decreasing both in population and wealth. When the right hon. Gentleman was alluding to the enormous diminution of the Irish population he did not appear to regard that as a grievous thing for Ireland. This Report about the financial relations of Ireland was produced in the year 1894. Did the House realise the fact that Ireland had lost since, 3,600,000 of her population? And yet they were told that Ireland had no grievance, and that Ireland was prosperous. The whole thing was tragic. He had always said that he did not believe that the present Chief Secretary fell below any of his predecessors in his desire to do good to Ireland. But if any amount of local grants were given to Ireland, and at the same time her taxation was increased, what was given with one hand was taken away with the other. It was a question which it was difficult for anyone to say anything about. He had called the attention of the House to the fact five or six times that whereas every other part of the Empire was increasing in content, prosperity, and population this part of the Empire was steadily going down. It was a thing which brought grief and distraction to Irishmen and ought to bring shame and humiliation to Englishmen.

Colonel SAUNDERSON (Armagh, N.) said he sympathised with some of the remarks made by the hon. Gentleman opposite who had just resumed his seat, but could not subscribe to them all. He had always held the view that the financial relations between England and Ireland were not on a satisfactory basis, but he did not agree with the speech of the hon. Member. He disliked the tone of the speeches which sometimes prevailed on the opposite Benches in such debates as the present, because he hated to hear Ireland described as a country of hopelessly irreclaimable beggars. The population was declining it was true, and he was very sorry for it, but that the wealth of the country was decreasing he denied. He deplored the fact that Ireland was unable to retain a large population, but the population declined not from any inherent misfortune that hung over Ireland, but from the indisputable facts that in other countries there were offered to Irishmen opportunities which did not exist in Ireland to prove their capacity. If hon. Members could give coal mines to Ireland it would be different, but how could they create in Ireland industries which could vie with the industries of England, Scotland, and America? The Irish, who were the most intelligent race on the face of the earth, said, "Why should we go on living in this country where we can earn only 1s. 2d. or 1s. 6d. a day, when we can go to England, or Scotland, or America, where we can earn three times the sum, with an infinitely better prospect of rising in life." They might well say this in the congested districts of the South-west, or, indeed, anywhere except in the North-east of Ulster, where they had given Irishmen a chance of showing what they were made of. He did not agree that Ireland was decreasing in wealth. He ventured to say, if they calculated the wealth per head of the Irish people, that in the last twenty years Irishmen had become three times as wealthy as they were. The fault he had always found with the Irish Government on the question of spending British money in Ireland was that the Chief Secretary could do very little, as the Member for Louth had said in his admirable speech. The Government of Ireland lacked the elasticity which would enable them to spend the money in Ireland which they knew ought to be spent there, without applying for it to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who, as a rule, was not sympathetic about spending much British money in Ireland. The speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer indicated to him that a certain amount of elasticity had set in at the Treasury. He thought Bann drainage was looking up. The Chief Secretary for Ireland, who desired to further the industries of the country and the wealth of Ireland as much as anyone he had seen in that high position, was bound to meet them, when they asked for an expenditure in Ireland, with the statement "I will do it with the greatest pleasure, but there is the Chancellor of the Exchequer." Now the Chief Secretary could not say that again, when he pointed out in his most persuasive tones that a sum might be laid out with great advantage in Ulster—he would not mention the precise locality—he could not say now that the Chancellor of the Exchequer would not sanction it. They had now a Chancellor of the Exchequer who was in a most sympathetic mood, and, with a little squeezing, was ready to part with a certain amount of money. The Chancellor of the Exchequer made a gesture. He did not know what that sign meant, but he hoped it was not a sign of the negative. In the new Army Regulations, a general commanding a district was now allowed to sanction a small outlay. Formerly if 1s. 6d. was needed to buy a chin strap for a soldier the general commanding could not authorise that outlay, but had to send it to the War Office, to get the approval of red tape, and many clerks, and very often the chin strap was not forthcoming. Now they were going to allow a certain amount of elasticity in that matter. That was what he wanted given to the Chief Secretary for Ireland. When the Chief Secretary was persuaded that a certain expenditure was necessary to develop the resources and welfare of Ireland, he ought to have power to get the money. He did not think any Chief Secretary was likely to expend an extravagant amount in furthering the welfare of the country he was supposed to rule.

As to how he should vote he regretted extremely he should have to vote against the proposal of hon. Members opposite. The hon. Member for the Scotland Division said there was nothing original in the debate. He never heard a more original debate in the House. They had heard Members opposite say what he had never heard them say before, though he had often thought it, that Irishmen were not fit for representative government. The hon. Member for Louth stated that was the case. What he wanted was a ruler—an Orangeman would do, so long as he was not subject to the government of that House.

MR. T. M. HEALY: So long as he would rule without the control of Parliament.

COLONEL SAUNDERSON said perhaps that was only a piece of fireworks. The hon. Member for Oldham had taken his first step in the Home Rule direction. His hon. friend came over to Ireland on that very question of the financial relations of Ireland with England, and addressed a company of bankers. He said—

> "Talk about dumping as an enemy to trade! As far as Ireland is concerned the great dumper is her gigantic neighbour."

He thought at the time this country had dumped many millions of pounds on Ireland, and he never heard Irishmen take objection to that form of dumping. They had had, too, the suggestion that a new form of Home Rule might be proposed which would deal very largely with the question of finance. His hon. friend might then occupy the position of Chief Secretary. If he did he hoped that the generosity which characterised him in his unofficial character would characterise his official character. They should all hail that with satisfaction. The reason he opposed the Amendment was very simple. He was still of opinion that Ireland was not fairly treated in this matter, and if the Amendment had simply expressed that fact he should have voted for it. It said a great deal more than that, however. It said that, in view of the inequitable nature of the existing financial relations between Great Britain and Ireland, the House declines to sanction any measure involving additional taxation until these relations are adjusted on an equitable basis. The Amendment, so far as those voting for it were able, would prevent them having an Army or a Navy, or carrying on the business of the country. He was not prepared to assent to a proposal of that kind. He looked upon the financial relations between England and Ireland as very important, but the defence of the Empire and the maintenance of its security he looked upon as a thousand times more important, and he hoped that the Chief Secretary, now that his colleague the Chancellor of the Exchequer appeared to be in a sympathetic humour, would seize the occasion to strike while the iron was hot, and get a certain amount of money from the British Exchequer to improve the finances of Ireland.

MR. HEMPHILL (Tyrone, N.) expressed his astonishment at the closing remarks of the right hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for North Armagh. For some years past the right hon. and gallant Gentleman had been a great advocate for the revision of the financial relations between England and Ireland, but now, when an Amendment was before the House having that effect in view, the right hon. and gallant Gentleman found himself unable to vote for it. He had been amused by the argument the right hon. and gallant Gentleman had put forward that the diminution of population was a sign rather of the growing wealth of Ireland than otherwise, it so reminded him of the old story that Ireland was the best country in the world to live out of because wages and employment were so much better elsewhere. Such conditions should not obtain in Ireland and it was because the conditions were such that the population of Ireland was diminishing year by year in this calamitous manner. The question was, Was Ireland fairly taxed or not? In particular, all Irishmen were bound to join in the protest that nothing had been done to carry out the recommendations of Mr. Childers' Commission. It was incumbent on Ireland to see that there was a revision of these financial relations, under the wrongs of which she had so long suffered. The right of Ireland to be taxed was based on the conditions contained in the treaty entered into between the independent Parliaments of England and Ireland at the time of the Union. A solemn contract was then entered into that the two countries were not to be subjected to a common taxation, but that the particular circumstances of each country were to be taken into consideration and each country was to be taxed according to its capacity. That contract had no right to be abrogated, except with the consent of both peoples. A Commission consisting of the most able financiers of both countries, although the majority were English, in 1897 came to the conclusion that the taxable capacity of Ireland was one-twentieth that of England, and that for many years Ireland had been overtaxed to the extent of £2,750,000 per annum. It was no answer for the Government to say that a certain proportion had been expended in Ireland. The hon. Member for North Dublin had clearly shown that that was a fallacy. It was no satisfaction to the poor peasant of Connemara to know that his tea and tobacco and whiskey had been overtaxed, but that the money had been expended in keeping up the several departments of Dublin Castle. The question was quite of a different character. The question was whether Ireland was or was not overtaxed, and the test of taxation was the equality of sacrifice and not equality of burden, and if, as was the case, an income of £12 in Ireland was taxed as much as an income of £40 in England, that was neither just nor fair. Ireland had no trade or commerce necessitating the maintenance of a Navy at a cost of £34,000,000 a year, neither had she shores to defend necessitating the maintenance of an Army at an annual cost of £32,000,000. The expenditure of Ireland would be amply met, if one-twentieth of the taxation was knocked off. That was the principle involved in this Amendment, and he asked for fair play in this matter; he asked the English Members to join with the Irish Party and show their sense of disapproval that nothing had been done to carry out the recommendation of the Childers' Commission, and to endeavour to adjust the taxation so as to at all events remove what was a crying grievance in Ireland.

Sir THOMAS ESMONDE (Wexford, N.) said that one of the interesting features of the present debate had been the admission by the Chancellor of the Exchequer that the present financial arrangements between England and Ireland were not proving satisfactory to the English Exchequer. The taxation in Ireland since 1864 had risen from £7,000,000 to £10,000,000 and it seemed to him that it had now reached the danger point alluded to by the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary in the speech which had already been quoted. If that was so, was it not time to consider whether some change could not be made in the present arrangements? The hon. Member for the St. Stephen's Division of Dublin had made the very valuable suggestion that a fixed contribution should be made by Ireland to the Imperial Exchequer, and that the rest of the taxation should be devoted to purposes purely Irish. That was really the key to the situation. Such an arrangement would be good business for Ireland. The right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer took exception to the discussion of Irish administration in this debate, but he himself had been guilty of the same error, because he had complained that the administration of Ireland was highly extravagant and that very little value had been obtained for the money expended upon it. The Irish people were perfectly prepared to join the Chancellor of the Exchequer in promoting economy in Irish administration, and to relieve the House of any discussion of the Budget by Irish Members, if the Government would allow the Irish nation to make a contribution of, say, £1,000,000, and to manage the balance of £6,000,000 or £7,000,000 in their own way. The right hon. Gentleman had referred to a Customs Committee of Inquiry. Was it to be understood that a Committee was at present sitting, or that one would be appointed?

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN was understood to say that the Board of Customs were inquiring into the real incidence of the Customs duties. When the new financial Return was laid before the House it would contain the figures on a new basis, and he hoped to be able to attach a Memorandum showing the difference in the modes of procedure by which the results were arrived at.

Sir THOMAS ESMONDE said that for years they had been trying to ascertain what the Customs figures really were, and he suggested that the right hon. Gentleman should not confine his energies to one year, but, if it was found to be of value, issue the Return year by year as a matter of course.

Mr. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick) complained that the present practice showed an entirely fictitious balance in respect of Ireland's contributions to the Exchequer. What was wanted was an international system of book-keeping which would show the real facts of the case. It was almost impossible to understand the present system under which Ireland was debited with amounts with which she ought to be credited and *vice versa*. He suggested that a supplementary Commission should be appointed to inquire into the results of the former Financial Relations Commission in order to see how matters stood at present. He also advocated the establishment of a department of the Board of Trade in Ireland. Hon. Members were mistaken if they supposed the feeling with regard to this over-taxation was less keen than formerly. It was only the acute agitation in connection with the land question which had allowed the matter to take a less prominent position, and the disappointment aroused by the Chancellor of the Exchequer's speech would probably cause the Irish people to realise that they must agitate once more if they were ever to get any satisfaction. The Nationalist Party, at any rate, would never let the matter rest until justice was done.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 278; Noes, 165. (Division List No. 126.)

AYES.

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Aird, Sir John
Allhusen, Augustus Hy. Eden
Allsopp, Hon. George
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir H.
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn. Gerald W. (Leeds
Banbury, Sir Frederick Georg.
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir Mich. Hicks
Beckett, Ernest William
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn
Brassey, Albert
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Glasgow
Campbell, J. H. M (Dublin Univ.
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. A (Worc.
Chamberlayne, T. (S'thampton
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Rt Hn. Sir John C. R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davies, Sir H. D. (Chatham)
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dickson-Poynder, Sir J. P.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r)
Fielden, Edward Brockleh'rst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hn. Edw'd Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, P. S. (Warwick, S.W.)
Fyler, John Arthur
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gordon, Hn J E (Elgin&Nairn
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Gordon, Maj. Evans-(T'r H'ml't
Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Green, Walford D. (Wednesbury
Greene, Sir E W (B'rySEdm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nderry
Hardy, L. (Kent, Ashford)
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th
Harris, Dr. Fredk. R. (Dulwich
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heath, James (Staffords, N.W.
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford, W.
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, J. (Mid., Tottenham)
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Hutton, John (Yorks, N.R.)
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hn. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Kemp, Lieut.-Colonel George
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
Knowles, Sir Lees
Lambton, Hn. Frederick Wm.
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, J. Grant (Yorks, N.R.
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lough, Thomas
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Calmont, Colonel James
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinb'rgh W
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell, Rt. Hn. Sir H. E (Wigt'n
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.)
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt. Hon. Sir Frederick G.
Mitchell, William (Burnley)
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants.
Moore, William
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray, C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. Graham (B'te
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Myers, William Henry

Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Herbert Pike(Darlingt'n
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Pym, C. Guy
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, Hn. M.W.(Stalybridge)
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethn'l Gre'n
Ritchie, Rt.Hn.Chas Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Rothschild, Hn. Lionel Walter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Saunderson, Rt.Hn.Col.Edw.J.
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, Sir H.(Renfrew
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W.Bromwich)
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Edw. James (Somerset
Stanley, Rt. Hn. Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir MarkJ.M‘Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walrond,Rt Hn.Sir William H.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt.-Col.A.C.E.(Taunt'n
Welby, SirCharles G.E.(Notts.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York,E.R.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd,SirW.H.(Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt.Hn.E.R.(Bath)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES.—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ambrose, Robert
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bell, Richard
Black, Alexander William
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Caldwell, James
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Clancy, John Joseph
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Crombie, John William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Delany, William
Devlin, Charles Ramsay(Galwy
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dobbie, Joseph
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellice,CaptEC(StAndrw's Bghs
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Evans,Sir FrancisH.(Maidstone
Evans, S. T. (Glamorgan)
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Field, William
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmund
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harcourt, LewisV.(Rossendale
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Healy, Timothy Michael
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hn. Charles H.
Hobhouse, C.E.H.(Bristol, E.)
Hope, John Deans (Fife,West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutchinson, Dr.Charles Fredk.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kilbride, Denis
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.
Leamy, Edmund
Leese, Sir J. F. (Accrington)
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M‘Crae, George
M‘Hugh, Patrick A.
M‘Kean, John
M‘Kenna, Reginald
M‘Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
M‘Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mitchell, Edw.(Fermanagh, N.)
Mooney, John J.
Moss, Samuel
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Newnes, Sir George
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willians
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Brien, Kendal(TipperaryMid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)

O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James(Wicklow, W.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, James(RoscommonN.
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rea, Russell
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L.(Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Slack, John Bamford
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C.(Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, D. Alfred (Merthyr)
Thomas, J. A. (Glamorg'nG'w.
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Walton, John Lawson(Leeds,S.
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
Wason, John C. (Orkney)
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath,North
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Fred W.(Norfolk,Mid.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.
Woodhouse, SirJ.T.(H'ddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Noes.—Sir Thomas Esmonde and Captain Donelan.

Bill accordingly read a second time, and committed for Tuesday, 31st May.

EVENING SITTING.

FREE FOOD.

*Mr. BLACK (Banffshire): Mr. Speaker. Although by the accident of the ballot the Motion of which I have given notice happens to be proposed from this side of the House, it would come equally appropriately from the other side, and indeed, from the Treasury Bench itself because, in the first place, the germ from which this Motion has sprung was suggested by the Prime Minister himself, the last time he spoke with regard to the question before the House; in the second place, the Motion has been adjusted with, and has the approval of, many of the Government's most enthusiastic supporters on the other side of the House, and in the third place, because both in form, subject, and intention it may be described as a vote of confidence in the Government *ad hoc.* Indeed, I am not sure that among those who have hitherto occupied a position of some doubt on the great question before the House, this Motion is not also received with some degree of welcome as tending to terminate the period of suspense in which they have been kept by the declarations of the Prime Minister. At least they will now have an opportunity of determining finally what their position is to be in this House, and more particularly with their constituents who, no doubt, are also in a position of some anxiety as to what their Member is to do with regard to this particular question; an opportunity that will be welcomed by many Members on that side who have been compelled, *nolens volens*, to sit on the fence on this all-important question. But this opportunity seems to have to some extent been snatched away by an Amendment which, at the eleventh hour, indeed, I might say after the twelfth hour last night, was put down in the name of the Prime Minister. One is tempted to ask what good purpose can the Prime Minister possibly expect to serve by pursuing this policy of procrastination in declaring his mind frankly to this House and to the country; what good purpose can be served by the policy, which I may describe as a policy of "sham, shuffle, and shunt," which has been pursued by the Prime Minister, and one or two of his supporters on this important question. If the Prime Minister were here—I do not see him in his place—he seems to have run away from the debate as well as from the Motion—I suppose he would answer, "At all costs I must keep my Party together." That is the kind of reason that up to now has been advanced by the Prime Minister. But Party is one thing and people is another. I agree that if a Party be newly come into power with the full confidence of the country to carry out some great project of national reform, some minor differences might be sunk to keep the Party together, but when we find a decrepit Ministry seeking to cling to the honours and emoluments of office by temporising and petty expedients, such as the Prime Minister putting down a Motion of confidence in himself, then I say the time has come when the Government which has to resort to such expedients to keep itself in power had best appeal to the country and get a fresh mandate.

I shall now proceed to read to the House the declarations of the Government on this important subject. On two occasions have Ministers, speaking not as individuals but as the Government, declared quite clearly the Government's policy with regard to the taxation of food. The Home Secretary, speaking to the Motion of my right hon. friend the Member for Montrose Burghs on the 15th of February, gave vent to the following utterance. After laying down the policy of the Government with regard to retaliation, with regard to which the Motion I submit to the House does not commit hon. Members either for or against, the right hon. Gentleman said—

> "The Government have no intention of taxing raw material and their policy does not include the taxation of food; neither do the Government propose the imposition of any taxation for the purpose of fostering a home industry which is subjected only to natural and legitimate competition."

Then at the close of the right hon. Gentleman's speech in answer to Questions put to him by two of his own supporters, the right hon. Gentleman stated—

> "I have said that the Government are opposed to any duty on raw material or food."

Mr. MALCOLM (Suffolk, Stowmarket): Then why this debate?

*Mr. BLACK: Then in the House of Lords, four days after, Lord Lansdowne, speaking for the Government, and as the Government was asked whether the Government endorsed the answer given by the Home Secretary, said—

> "I have not the slightest objection to accept that statement also."

And he went on to say—

> "I say categorically that we as a Government are opposed to a duty on raw materials or food stuffs. Why is it that we are told that our policy leads inevitably down an inclined plane to the Birmingham Abyss."

I think I see what mental image Lord Lansdowne had in his mind when he used that expression. I think he must have had in his mind the case of certain creatures of the same species as those who have assumed the name of "whole-hoggers" who, on one occasion, ran violently down a steep place into the sea. Possibly in the future those who term themselves "whole-hoggers" may with advantage assume the more elegant title of Gadarenes.

Then Lord Lansdowne went on to say with great emphasis—

> "I believe that instead of leading to Birmingham it leads, if anything, in the opposite direction."

I must congratulate the right hon. Member for West Birmingham and those who think with him on their taking those declarations of the Government lying down. Those are the declarations on which my Motion is founded. They are very clear and distinct, and no *boná fide* out-and-out supporter of the Government can do otherwise than support the Motion I submit without involving themselves in the difficulty of showing dissent more or less from the policy so clearly enunciated. With regard to these statements of policy I make three distinct averments—First, these statements are very explicit declarations of the policy of the Government itself as distinguished from the views of individual Ministers undertaken after full consultation with and with the full consent of the Prime Minister himself. I am sorry that the Prime Minister is not present to assent to that statement; but his representative is present, and if it is not denied by the right hon. Gentleman it must be taken to be admitted, and it must be taken to be admitted during the rest of the debate. Second, the declarations applied clearly not to the policy of the Government during the present Parliament. That is expressly repudiated because it was said, "We are not dealing just now with the policy of the Government during the present Parliament, but the future policy of the Government in future Parliaments and as to the mandate to be asked at the next general election." The third proposition I ask to be either admitted or denied by the Government's representative is that although no Government is bound to make any declaration of its future policy beyond the limit of the present Parliament, if in order to obtain support it makes a declaration as to the mandate it is to ask from the country, then such a declaration becomes part of its fundamental policy and becomes subject to votes of confidence in the same way as any other portion of the fundamental policy of the Government. That I take it is admitted also. Very well. If these three premises be admitted, every member of the present Government is committed to the declarations made by the Home Secretary and Lord Lansdowne that they were opposed to any tax on food and more particularly to any protective tax on food, and the natural inference of this is that it is mere poltroonery on the part of the Prime Minister or any other member of the Government not to accept this Motion. If these statements have been made by the Government and their supporters ask them to accept the responsibility of these declarations, then it is mere cowardice and poltroonery for the Government to try and evade it. If on the other hand, the Government say they will not accept the vote and repudiate these declarations of Ministers because they do not represent their policy, there is only one other alternative. Either the Ministers who made the declarations must resign or the Prime Minister himself must resign. The Prime Minister has for too long pursued the *role* of a political Nicodemus. While the right hon. Gentleman has been wobbling, the ex-Colonial Secretary has been working—with the net result that unless some stop is put upon his methods the Government would come to play an amiable if not essential part of a political comet, in which the right hon. Member for West Birmingham would be the real and substantial head, and the Government the large and luminous but nebulous tail. While then, there has been some difference of opinion as to the degree of support to be given to the Government policy of retaliation, the one thing that the people of this country have indicated is that they will not have a protective tax on food. It has been the experience of Ayr burghs and every other recent election with the exception of that for South Birmingham, that any candidate putting forward the taxation of food as part of his policy was defeated. Further it has been necessary for many candidates who in the main are protectionist to disavow in the strongest manner the taxation of food before they could even obtain a hearing. Sir, if this matter were to be looked at from a purely Party point of view I should say that the more Members who voted against the Motion the better for the Party I support. I ask Members to transport themselves in imagination from this House to the platforms of the meetings which they will be called upon to address at the general election. The question will inevitably be put, "Are you or are you not in favour of the protective taxation of food?" If the answer to that question is "Yes" then the course of such an hon. Member is clear. But if the answer is to be "No," how can an hon. Member justify a vote given against the Motion I now submit to the House, and will he not, notwithstanding any platform declarations, be faced with the unanswerable question, "Why, then, on the 18th May, 1904, did you vote against a Motion condemning the protective taxation of food?" But the issues involved in this question are greater and higher than mere Party issues. The issue is whether the food of the people, the prime necessity of their existence, shall be made dearer and scarcer, not to serve any great national end but in order to swell the rent-roll of the landed interest. For my part, whatever decision the House may arrive at to-night, I cannot suppose that the country will subscribe to this new doctrine of "ransom," under which the people will have to pay such a price to a privileged caste in order to retain their right to live on the land, which is the inalienable and equal privilege of every subject of the Crown. I beg to move.

MR. GOSCHEN (Sussex, East Grinstead): In seconding the Motion I have to ask the indulgence of the House on this the first occasion on which I have addressed it. I do not intend to enter into an economic discussion as to what effect the taxation of food would in the opinion of some of us have on the people of this country, because I believe the interest of the House this evening is centred not in the argument by which such a policy could be pursued or defended, but in the position which some sections in this House assume on the question of taxing food, and especially the position adopted by the Government. The Motion expresses approval of the speeches made against the taxation of food by the Government; and surely they cannot object to, or shrink from, such an expression of opinion on the part of the House, nor can they possibly think that to emphasise their policy by such an expression of opinion could place them in an embarrassing situation. But whenever one of these fiscal debates takes place the House is always liable to surprises, and the situation has been somewhat suddenly changed. On the last occasion the free-fooders on these Benches came down to the House to support an Amendment which they believed would strengthen the hands of the Government. This time they come down to vote against an Amendment. The previous Amendment, in the name of the hon. Member for Ripon, was suddenly withdrawn, and, though the Amendment of the right hon. Member for West Birmingham has not been withdrawn, it has taken a secondary position to the Amendment placed on the Paper by the Government. We are somewhat curious to know why this Amendment has been placed on the Paper. Do the Government differ from the Amendment of the late Colonial Secretary, or is it the case only that they prefer their own Amendment to it? Whatever the reason may be and the result of the voting may be, surely we may say that the putting down of this Amendment by the Government is a notification of their conviction that a strong feeling exists against the taxation of food. Our methods of procedure in this House are often difficult to be understood, even by Members of Parliament, and are often unintelligible to people outside, and it is for this reason that I would have preferred that the people of the country should have kept their eyes on the declarations of Ministers against taxation of food as ratified by this House, rather than that they should have to be satisfied with the hypothetical question as to what the attitude of the Government may be on this question at some future date, because constituencies have, I think, come to the conclusion, partly from their own desire and partly from the hints and hopes expressed by others, that the policy of the Government is as it were a thin garment which may be blown away by a hurricane and for which will be substituted a stronger, rougher, and more expensive one woven by other hands. It is because I desire that the hands of the Government should not be weakened by any feeling of this kind that I am anxious to express approval of the speeches they have made against the taxation of food.

I should like to hear from the Prime Minister, however, what is the attitude of the Government towards those members of the Party who have loyally supported them in the past and who have differed from them only on this fiscal question. What is his attitude towards those Members who have not only supported him on other questions in the past, but who were prepared to accept the Sheffield policy though their constituents disagreed with them? Is the right hon. Gentleman prepared to support them against their constituents who desire the more advanced policy of the late Colonial Secretary? I assure the Prime Minister that it is against the policy of the late Colonial Secretary and not against his, that I and my hon. friends are so determinedly opposed. It is for this reason that we urge on the Prime Minister the fact that there must be no political alliance between him and the right hon. Member for West Birmingham, either of a passionate or a platonic nature. I do not accuse the right hon. Gentleman of a passionate attachment, but of a platonic affection I have some suspicion. I know there are some people who see no harm in a platonic affection, while there are others who see considerable danger, not knowing whither it may lead. I dare not decide between these two schools of thought. But I am convinced that if doubts exist the Prime Minister should be, as I am sure he wishes to be, above suspicion in this matter. Surely at a moment of crisis like this, when the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham, with all the enthusiasm and eloquence which he has at his command, is putting before the country a policy which entirely reverses our traditions, the Government must realise that the country comes to them to seek counsel not as to a Delphic oracle of old for a cryptic reply to be interpreted according to individual intelligence, but with a desire to know what are to be the conditions under which the battle is to be fought—whether the Government intend to assume a position of splendid isolation, relying on their own resources, or whether they have already made any treaty of reciprocity with one of the leaders of the opposing band.

It may possibly be that these debates should be closed in the House of Commons, but I venture to think that it is too late to say that they should be closed in the country. The question is far too important, and the issues too far-reaching, to bring them down to the level of a personal grievance. But if I venture to allude to my own personal position I do so, not by way of complaint, but merely by way of illustration. This is not the first occasion on which I have supported the speeches of the Government against the taxation of food. I did so in my constituency last autumn. What was the result? Two days afterwards a gentleman who supported the policy of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham was brought before the constituency, and he is now the accepted candidate. I fully realise that in every campaign there must be casualties and that the life of the private soldier is of little importance. But I should be ready to sacrifice myself if I believed that I was to be injured in a good cause, and my enthusiasm could only be damped if I had reason to believe that my injury was caused by want of preparation on the part of my leaders when the compaign began. I wish to submit a definite example of a danger which is overwhelming one or two of the Prime Minister's supporters, and has threatened, and is threatening, a great many of them. I feel sure that it is the right hon. Gentleman's desire to render every assistance that he can give to those who have loyally helped him in the past; and I venture with all submission to say that this can only be achieved by a speech on the part of the Government addressed to the trained intelligence of this House, as well as to the untrained intelligence of the country. I beg the right hon. Gentleman to assure the country that he will do his utmost to defend those of his Party who are opposed to the taxation of food, who have already suffered and are in imminent danger, and that they may look to him in the future to be their leader in the time of danger.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House, believing that the protective taxation of food would be burdensome to the people and injurious to the Empire, welcomes the declarations of Ministers that the Government is opposed to such taxation."—(*Mr. Black.*)

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): At the invitation of my right hon. friend I rise to move in a few words, almost formally, the Amendment which stands in his name. He has asked me to perform this small office in order that he may reserve his speech until a period when the debate has developed and is more matured. I am sure my hon. friend the Member for the East Grinstead Division of Sussex will not think I am guilty of any disrespect to him if I venture to suggest that the intervention of the Prime Minister will be more timely at a later hour and a more usual hour than half-past nine o'clock. All hon. Members who have not felt, as the mover of the Motion on the Paper feels, that its purport is so obvious, that it is inspired by such an amiable feeling towards all Ministers and to all the Members of the House as to need no further discussion, that we all ought to vote for it and go home, and that there is no excuse for the Amendment put down by the Prime Minister, will not differ from my point of view. But I wish to point out in a few words that my right hon. friend and the Government invite the House to say that it is unnecessary to discuss the question of fiscal reform, that it is unnecssary to discuss the declaration made by the Prime Minister at Sheffield, with which we are all so familiar. We hold that it is unnecessary to discuss either the question of fiscal reform or the well-known declaration of the Prime Minister at Sheffield on two grounds. The first ground is that no proposals, as hon. Members are perfectly well aware, embodying what is called the Sheffield policy, announced so clearly by the Prime Minister so long ago as October last, are to be proposed during either this session of Parliament or during any session of the existing Parliament. The second ground is that we desire to proceed with the business proposed in the King's Speech. Hon. Members laugh. I derive a good deal of amusement from the hilarity with which hon. Members greet a very commonplace proposition. The proposition that the policy of the Cabinet as embodied in the King's Speech and their administrative action are matters with which Parliament is concerned is always received with shouts of ridicule as an amazing paradox, and we are told again and again that there is a great question before the House. What that question is hon. Members do not seem to be very clear, and there is no reason why they should wish to explain to the House subjects which they have not studied or which they do not understand. The hon. Member who moved the Motion said it was an elucidation of certain declarations of the Prime Minister's. The Prime Minister has said that the Sheffield policy is not to be dealt with during the existence of the present Parliament, and that when he goes to the country his policy will be found to be the policy which he announced at Sheffield. All that is familiar to us. But the hon. Member has tried to make that statement far more attractive. He illustrated it with parables, and supposed that we should like it a great deal better than a perfectly plain declaration from the Prime Minister. He is at a loss to understand how any one can be so lacking in sense as to refuse to accept his Motion with effusiveness. We support the Amendment of the Prime Minister because we do not think the Motion put upon the Paper by the hon. Member for Banffshire is an improvement upon the statement that we have heard from the Prime Minister. In the first place it is very ambiguous. There are a number of words used to which different people attach different interpretations. In the second place, it is invidious, and meant to be invidious. Attention is drawn to the declarations of certain Ministers.

*MR. BLACK: The right hon. Gentleman is misrepresenting the terms of my Motion. It does not attract attention to certain Ministers, but to the declarations of Ministers.

MR. WYNDHAM: I have been following this Motion with some curiosity. Certainly, if it is only intended to illuminate the statement made by the Prime Minister it has caused a good deal of suppressed commotion, and I have seen it stated in the public Press that the word "certain" should be eliminated. The hon. Member has got rid of one, but not of the other. His Motion begins, "To call attention to the declaration of certain Ministers." It is quite true that he may have given instructions which have not been perfectly carried out, for the removal of the word "certain" before "Ministers" in the last line.

*MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL (Oldham): Fancy making a point of that!

MR. WYNDHAM: My hon. friend the Member for Oldham is pained that I should make a point of that. If the word "certain" had gone in both places I should have drawn attention to their omission at the last moment, and should have asked my hon. friend to hold with me that the intention of a Motion of this kind may be gathered from the phraseology in which it was originally couched. If that phraseology is such that the Motion purports to be a censure on certain Ministers and an encomium passed upon others, then I say it is a censure passed upon the Cabinet as a whole. If it is not a censure, what is it? It is meant to be censure, because we are supposed to have neglected the proper observation of the great doctrine of Cabinet responsibility. Now that is what the hon. Member who moved this wishes the world to understand to-morrow, and we say that there is no vestige of truth in the charge. It is as a vote of censure on the Government that we repudiate it. This is a revival of the piece we had played on the Address—the piece of the two voices. Why, in practice we have carried out the doctrine of Cabinet responsibility to greater lengths than it has ever been carried before. And not only are we all responsible, as we have pointed out, for the measures mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, not only are we at one on all administrative questions, but we have stated what our policy will be in this matter during the whole of this Parliament, and, more than that, the Prime Minister has gone out of his way to state what his election address will be. And now we are told that the question before the House is some impossibility or unwillingness on the part of hon. Members opposite to take the perfectly clear words which have been uttered by every Minister who has spoken upon this question. We do not recognise in this Amendment a mere paraphrase of what the Prime Minister has said. I suppose it is meant to be that sincerest form of flattery, imitation; but when imitation is grotesque, when it is adopted with a wink and a chuckle, it is called mimicry and is considered offensive. Therefore, in holding the Motion on the Paper to be in the nature of a vote of censure, veiled it may be, but none the less a vote of censure, and holding that on many questions we may, if our hopes are granted, be of service to the country and the Empire in South Africa, and in many other parts of the world—hon. Members opposite no doubt hold a contrary view — but seriously believing that, as we do, it seems more important than a speculation as to what we or someone else would say at a general election at some future time. I will not elaborate that, because it is so obvious to any one who listened to the concluding remarks of the Prime Minister last night what the policy is, and those of my hon. friends who support the Government will support the Prime Minister in his Amendment to a Motion which he regards as a vote of censure deliberately moved.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out from the word 'House' to the end of the Question, in order to add the words 'considers it unnecessary to discuss the question of fiscal reforms and the declaration of the Prime Minister at Sheffield on 1st October in regard to which His Majesty's Government have announced that no proposals will be laid before the present Parliament, and expressing its continued confidence in the present Administration, desires to proceed with the business proposed in the Gracious Speech from the Throne'—(*Mr. Wyndham*)—instead thereof."

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Lord HUGH CECIL (Greenwich): I always listen to my right hon. friend the Chief Secretary with delight, but I do not think I ever listened to him with more amusement than this evening. He is in the unhappy position of having to maintain a great many propositions which his own mind is much too clear to make plausible to the House of Commons. I confess that without the aid of thought-reading I could never have read into the Motion before the House so many things as the Chief Secretary read into it, and I am inclined to suspect, as one often is obliged to suspect in cases of thought-reading, some ulterior motive on the part of the medium who operates. The Motion, I confess, seems to me a very plain matter. I am quite sure my right hon. friend the Member for West Birmingham fully understands it. He quite understands it because he has all the sensitiveness of the person attacked. He knows that this Motion is directed against him and his policy. It is not directed against the Government, and it is rather surprising, I think, that they should suppose it. [Cries of "Oh!"] Well, will any one point out a single word in the Motion which is against the Government?

Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN (Birmingham, W.): I understand that my noble friend appeals to me. He says that I am the person attacked, and not the Government, and he asks how any one can pretend to show that the Government is concerned. Permit me to say that if I were the only person attacked it would be perfectly easy to have left out all reference——

Sir WILFRID LAWSON (Cornwall, Camborne): Mr. Speaker, I rise to order, Sir, to ask whether the right hon. Gentleman is entitled to get up and make a speech generally.

*Mr. SPEAKER: The noble Lord gave way. The right hon. Gentleman will no doubt not take undue advantage of the opportunity afforded him.

Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I understand, Mr. Speaker, that my noble friend challenged me and others who think with me in regard to a particular question. I shall certainly confine myself to answering his challenge, but owing to the interruption I must again repeat what I understand the noble Lord meant. I understand the challenge to be that the Motion is an attack upon myself—that is to say, upon my policy; and is in no sense an attack upon Ministers. I say that that would have been perfectly clear if there had been no reference to Ministers in the Resolution. But as the Resolution, as it appears on the Paper, singles out the opinions of certain Ministers—[Cries of "No" and cheers]—as it appears on the Paper; the notice is probably in the hands of Members. The notice is to call attention to the declarations of certain Ministers. [Cries of "No."] That is the Motion on the Paper. [Renewed interruption and OPPOSITION cries of "Cecil," and "Order."] I cannot presume, Mr. Speaker—[Cries of "Order"]—I cannot, of course, answer interruptions, but I must merely answer the noble Lord. Owing to the form of the notice on the Paper I and many others consider that the Ministry as well as myself are attacked.

LORD HUGH CECIL: I am glad that I have given the right hon. Gentleman this opportunity of making an explanation, and perhaps I may say in general that there is nothing I desire less than that he should not be treated with the greatest respect. But I confess that the explanation does not impress me much. He says that but for the word "Ministers" this would not be an attack upon them. Therefore, his proposition is that, if you refer to Ministers in laudatory terms then you attack them. The only possible way of not attacking Ministers, by his account, is not to mention them. Well, he is a supporter of the Ministry. "Save me from my friends." I confess I think that in his zeal for what he calls "our Government," he is carried beyond the limits of reason. I read this Resolution according to the ordinary meaning of the English language. I do not really care what was the motive for the Motion being put down. What does that matter to me? I care for my motive in voting upon it. I care for its plain meaning, as it will be understood in this House, and as it will be understood from one end of the country to the other; and, looking upon it in that light, I say that it is a Motion which does, indeed, reject in terms the policy with which my right hon. friend the Member for West Birmingham is associated, but which does not say anything whatever about the action of Ministers, except to praise them for rejecting that policy.

Now, I only ventured to catch your eye, Mr. Speaker, for a very few minutes, because I desired to say a few words to explain the vote which many of us will be obliged to give. We find ourselves quite unexpectedly in a difficult position. My right hon. friend the Chief Secretary appeared to comment severely on alterations made in the Motion at what he called the last moment. No doubt he has admonished the Prime Minister in private, for down to the very last possible moment he delayed to put down an Amendment of the highest possible importance, throwing every one into a great deal of confusion by so doing. I am obliged to say that I think that course has been taken with less justification than might often have been urged for it. My right hon. friend the Prime Minister has known for ten days past—known privately, without disclosures in the Press—that many of his supporters, feeling that it expressed their views, were disposed to support the Motion standing in the name of the hon. Member for Banffshire. He had ten days in which to take any step he thought proper, ten days in which to communicate, if he pleased, with those interested. I believe that he has had frequent communications with the right hon. Member for West Birmingham; but I do not think he has had communication, so frequent at any rate, with those who are interested in this from the other point of view.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): That is quite imaginary.

LORD HUGH CECIL: At any rate, he has had plenty of opportunity for putting down his Amendment, if he wished to put it down, six, or seven, or eight days ago. I am not complaining of my right hon. friend, who has had many other things to think of; but I am obliged to point out the position in which he has placed these hon. Members. I have no doubt he wished to do what was perfectly proper; but inevitably we are placed in an embarrassing position—a subject of gratification to my right hon. friend the Member for West Birmingham. I appreciate that point of view. The policy which he urges is fundamentally opposed to the policy which we advocate. I confess I wish the notice given in the name of the Government had been given somewhat earlier, in order that we might have had a longer time for reflection. How does the matter stand now? The Amendment in the name of the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister has much, no doubt, to recommend it. It is better—if I may say so without any personal discourtesy—both in the circumstances and in its origin, as well as in its natural character, than the Motion that stood in the name of the Member for West Birmingham. We greatly prefer it to that one. But I confess I find it very unnecessary that the question of confidence in Ministers should be dragged into a controversy which has no relation to the confidence of this House in Ministers. We are debating upon a Wednesday evening—a time consecrated by long Parliamentary usage to the discussion of what are called abstract questions—questions of high political interest. We are, therefore, asked to vote upon a Motion which, if the Government had not treated it in this unusual way, would be a Motion to be judged on its natural merits. Why should the Government bring in confidence at all? I confess I do not understand why they should have done it. But so anxious were I and many of my hon. friends to avoid voting against the Government on a question of confidence that I made a proposal to the Prime Minister in private which I will repeat in public. I proposed, and propose now, that this debate should be carried over to another day, that we who approve on its merits of the Motion standing in the name of the Member for Banffshire should not press the matter to a division, and, if there were a division, should take no part in it or should vote for the Government, but on a future day, when the Amendment of the Prime Minister became the original Motion, should be at liberty to move an Amendment to that Motion expressing our views—an Amendment which would be perfectly consistent with the policy of the right hon. Gentleman. I understand that proposal is not acceptable to the Government. I want to point out that we are not to be blamed if, deciding at the last moment and in very difficult circumstances, we elect to make a proposal which seems to me, I confess, a very reasonable proposal, and when it is rejected are driven where we shall be driven.

I am told that this is a question of confidence. I can understand that being said about the second question which will be put, I suppose, this evening unless the debate is carried too far, the question of inserting the words of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister. But, on the question of omitting the words of the Member for Banffshire, I do not see that any question of confidence is concerned. We are told that it is a question of confidence. That means that the Government would resign if they were placed in a minority on that question—the question of omitting the words of the Member for Banffshire. Figure to yourselves the picture. The Prime Minister would have to request an audience of the King and say, "Your Majesty, I am unable any longer to conduct the administration of the country because the House of Commons persists in welcoming declarations made by members of Government." I could not have thought that outside "Alice's Adventures through the Looking-glass" such a proceeding would be possible. I do not regard this Motion as in any sense reflecting on the Government. It asserts what is the view of those who have all along opposed the policy of the Member for West Birmingham; and, if it is raised, as no doubt it is, in an inconvenient mode, I cannot help observing that we have often wished to have a debate of a more formal and lengthy character which should raise explicitly the question of the Birmingham policy detached from any other consideration. We have no wish to criticise the Government or attack the Sheffield policy. Many of those who are free-traders are strong supporters of the Sheffield policy; others, like myself, would like to hear it further developed before they commit themselves. But we should have been glad to have an opportunity of discussing the Birmingham policy, and we have been unable to do so, but we have not received in our desire any co-operation from my right. hon. friend the Member for West Birmingham himself. He prefers to discuss this question on the platform. The platform has many advantages. There are considerable facilities for selecting your audience, and there are securities against reply. To persons of my right hon. friend's economic opinions those privileges are dear indeed. I notice that my right hon. friend, commenting on those who only go part of the way which he thinks ought to be trod, describes them as weak-kneed and half-hearted. He himself belongs to the Cromwellian school. I do not think my right hon. friend is very like Cromwell. I doubt whether Cromwell would have shrunk from a debate. I agree, however, that if my right hon. friend means the probable silencing of the House of Commons no one could be more like. But I confess I should rather compare my right hon. friend to Bob Acres in the comedy, who exhibited courage elsewhere than on the field of battle, because my right hon. friend shrinks, like that character, from facing his opponents on the field of combat which is the House of Commons. When Bob Acres found himself in that situation his courage oozed out through the ends of his fingers. I cannot conceive why we should be deprived of the opportunity of debating and voting upon the Birmingham policy without any hiding behind the Government.

Well, Sir, I regret that the Government are not able to leave this discussion open to the decision of the House. I regret that it is so. I think their conduct will be severely commented on outside these walls. I think people will fail to understand what are the motives that lead the Government on the path they are treading. I am sure those motives are high-minded and magnanimous in their character; but no one can deny that it is impossible for them to give that impression to the great mass of the people of this country. What the people want is to have a fair issue, fairly and squarely decided. No one blames those who are protectionists, no one blames my right hon. friend for maintaining his protectionist views. What we blame him and the Government for is for withholding from the House of Commons the opportunity of expressing a fair opinion one way or the other. [Interruptions, and cries of "Order," "Collings," and "Bowles."]

*Mr. SPEAKER: I do appeal to hon. Members to abstain from interruptions and recriminations.

Lord HUGH CECIL: I confess I do not regard this as a Motion in any way reflecting upon the Government, I said it appeared to me to be a statement of the position we have all along maintained. I confess, therefore, that it seems impossible myself to do otherwise than to vote in support of the Motion. [Opposition cheers and ironical Ministerial cheers.] I am glad my right hon. friend applauds that—I can assure him I am accustomed to vote in favour of my opinions and not to shrink from them. At any rate the issue is a plain one. The Motion expresses what we had hoped and believed to be, and what I still believe to be, the attitude of the Government in regard to the taxation of food. As the proper expression of the view of those who resist the taxation of food, among whom I may, I hope, include the Government, I shall support that Motion in the Lobby, voting, as it is my duty to do, in support of my convictions.

Sir M. HICKS BEACH (Bristol, W.): This is the third time in the course of the present session on which the subject of fiscal policy has been under the consideration of this House. On the first occasion we had a debate in which practically any Member on both sides of the House who desired to express his opinion on the subject was able to take part. That debate was originated by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Montrose, who desired to express his opinion and the opinion of the House, that the removal of protective duties had been of great advantage to this country and that their restoration would be a great injury to the country. On the second occasion the hon. Member for Aberdeenshire asked us to record our disaproval of a protective and preferential tariff. I agree with the abstract opinions which were expressed in both those Resolutions. I agree with them now; but I voted against those

Resolutions and I would vote against them again: because both in form and in substance they were votes of censure on His Majesty's Government, a Government which I was returned here to support, and which, in my opinion, has done nothing and said nothing whatever, either in this House or in the country, which justifies the censure proposed by those Resolutions. Well, Sir, now this evening we have a Resolution which is of a different character. It does not propose in its terms any censure upon His Majesty's Government. On the contrary, it expresses a distinct approval, amended as it has been at the last moment, of the opinions which Ministers have expressed on the subject of the protective taxation of food. In that view I entirely agree. I believe that, if we could know the opinion upon that subject of the majority of the present House of Commons, the majority of the present House of Commons would be opposed to the protective taxation of food. But I feel quite certain that the majority of the constituencies of this country would be opposed to the protective taxation of food. Up to this morning we had to decide between this Motion and the Amendment of my right hon. friend the Member for West Birmingham. I should have supported the Motion against that Amendment. I should have done so because I object to the vague terms in which a change in our fiscal policy was alluded to in the Amendment of my right hon. friend, when I couple those terms with the opinions and the action in which he has been so prominent throughout the country. But it is not necessary to pursue that subject now that Amendment is defunct. It may be paired off with a certain other Amendment which had an even briefer life on another occasion, and I will not pretend to shed a tear over its grave. The Prime Minister, or rather the Chief Secretary for Ireland, on behalf of His Majesty's Government, has moved another Amendment to the Motion which is before the House; and that Amendment traverses the Motion of the hon. Member for Banffshire, and, besides traversing that Motion, it contains what to my mind is a matter of some importance—a reference to the Sheffield policy, a policy with which I agree.

My noble friend who has just sat down asked why, seeing that the Motion of the hon. Member for Banffshire is a Motion approving the action of the Government, we cannot all support it. Well, under ordinary circumstances it might have been thought that the Motion of the hon. Member for Banffshire might have been accepted by this House with the tolerant acquiescence of the Government, just as many such Motions of private Members are constantly accepted on a Wednesday evening. But my noble friend is, compared with me, I am sorry to say, a young Member of this House. Cannot he see in the crowded Benches before him, did he not detect in the speech of the hon. Member for Banffshire what this Motion, so innocent, so complimentary in its terms, really means? I do not wish to impute motives to any man, and I cannot judge of the motive of the hon. Member for Banffshire; but it is a little odd that that hon. Member, being as we have always known him to be, and as his speech to-night shows him to be, a very active and very determined opponent of His Majesty's Government, should, when he had the good fortune to obtain by the ballot the last opportunity in the present session on which a private Member may propose a Motion to the House, have chosen—have wasted his good fortune in proposing a vote of approval of the action of His Majesty's Government. Now, does not that invite us to look a little behind the words of the hon. Member for Banffshire in considering the Amendment proposed by His Majesty's Government? But there is another point. I agree, as I have said already, in the terms of the hon. Member for Banffshire, I object to protective taxation on food. Well, but does that cover the whole of the future fiscal policy of His Majesty's Government? It is perfectly clear that the terms of the Motion of the hon. Member for Banffshire cover only what may be described as the negative policy of His Majesty's Government, and does not touch at all the positive policy of His Majesty's Government, which surely is a matter of some importance in their consideration and in the consideration of this House. If it had been possible that the Motion of the hon. Member for Banffshire should have been put from the Chair as a substantive question, I for one should have voted for the addendum to the Motion my hon. friend the Member for Clapham has placed on the Paper, which would make it perfectly clear that the Motion was an approval not merely of their negative policy in being opposed to a protective tax on food, but also of their positive policy as being prepared to suggest to a future Parliament a policy of negotiation with foreign countries for the reduction of their high tariffs, enforced, if necessary, by retaliation in cases where we could not get fair terms. I will put this test to the Motion of the hon. Member for Banffshire. Suppose his Motion had been so amended as to declare the whole fiscal policy of His Majesty's Government, would he vote for it himself? Is that not another indication of what this Motion really means? I might almost say, "In vain is the net spread in the sight of any bird," if my noble friend who has just sat down had not shown so great a desire to jump into it.

Now, after all, what is it that the hon. Member for Banffshire asks us to do? His speech really consisted mainly of a series of quotations from speeches of members of the Ministry establishing the principle of his Motion. He quoted from the Prime Minister, he quoted from the Home Secretary, he quoted from Lord Lansdowne, passages all declaring their objection to protective taxation on food. That is the negative part of the Sheffield policy. Can there be any doubt of it? Does any Member really believe that that is not part of the Sheffield policy? Why, the hon. Member for Banffshire has himself established it. What has the Prime Minister said on the matter? I do not like to trouble the House with quotations, but this is an important point, and perhaps I may read this. Everybody knows that in his Sheffield speech, to which he calls our special attention in the Amendment to the Motion, he said—

> "A tax on food is not within the range of practical politics."

And then more recently in this House he said—

> "I do not think public opinion is in a condition to accept any proposition in regard to taxation of food, or fiscal union with the Colonies so far as this depends on taxation of food."

Sir M. Hicks Beach.

Then he went on to say—

> "The Sheffield programme is that which if occasion arose to-morrow, I would set before the country so far as fiscal reform is concerned."

Well, I am a supporter of His Majesty's Government; I repose some confidence in the Prime Minister; I accept the declarations of the Prime Minister on that subject. I do not myself believe that any advantage will be gained from passing a Resolution to-night which does no more than embody the declarations which the hon. Member who moved it himself admits have been made by the Government on this subject—more especially when, as everybody knows very well, no one proposes to bring any alteration of our fiscal policy before the present Parliament, and when any Resolution which might be placed on our records on this question of fiscal policy would have no weight whatever upon the judgment of the constituencies who will in the end be called upon to decide the matter.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Like my right hon. friend who has just sat down, I also was a member, a short time ago, and even later than he, of His Majesty's Government. Up to the time that I left that Government I was in absolute accord with my colleagues as to their policy. I am very glad to say that since I have left that Government I have remained in absolute accord with their policy and their professions. Therefore in anything I may say I frankly admit, however much hon. Gentlemen opposite may object to such a statement, that my object is to support the Government, and for the simple reason that in all questions of confidence it is a question of loyalty. If you agree with the practical, immediate, definite policy of a Government you are bound to do your best to support that Government. I have said there exists such an agreement between me and my right hon. friends on that Bench. They have, in my opinion, done a great work in the past, they have undertaken a great work for the future. I believe in that work, I desire to give them every support in carrying it to a successful conclusion. When this question of fiscal reform first arose, it took what I frankly admit were to me unexpected proportions, and I found that my continuance in the Government might embarrass the Government, might even weaken it; and I retired from the Government. I think the other day I was accused by the hon. Member for Oldham of having exhibited cowardice, because, forsooth, I had relinquished what are called the sweets and certainly the emoluments of office in order to carry out, to promote, my own convictions, and in order not to embarrass my political friends. I am prepared to leave the judgment of my conduct to the House, to opponents as well as to friends. But from the moment I became a private Member, as I have said, I agree with all that the Government has done, but I am not bound to; and certainly they are not bound to agree with me, and they are not responsible for anything that I have said. I have gone out into the wilderness, if you please, as you tell me, on a hopeless expedition, which ought, I think, to satisfy even the most malignant adversary; and I have not asked either the Government or any Members of this House to commit themselves to my policy. There is a division of opinion as to that policy in this Parliament. I do not want to be exceptionally controversial, more controversial than I can help, so I will not talk about the proportions in which that division exists. But this I will say, that while on the one side those Gentlemen who differ from me are aggressive, and demand that the Government and that this House and that every Member shall pledge themselves in regard to a policy which at present is only in the condition of a policy for discussion, all that we—those who hold my views—ask is, that the Government and our friends should say nothing which should prevent the possibility of that policy.

Well, the fiscal question is to me almost a phenomenon, it has had almost unexpected developments. It seems to me to be like ecclesiastical questions; apparently it affects some minds, and even sane minds, with a kind of extreme bigotry, I might almost say a kind of uncharitableness, which I am not aware of as existing in regard to other matters of controversy. There is my noble friend the Member for Greenwich, the most amiable of men, who entertains a very strong opinion upon this subject, to which he is as much entitled as I am to my equally strong opinion in the opposite direction. But thereupon he gets up, and while he professes respect—Heaven save the mark—for his opponents, he accuses those opponents of the most contemptible of vices. He explains elaborately, amongst the enthusiastic cheers of, as I suppose, his political opponents, he explains to them that he has the utmost respect for a man whom in the next breath he accuses of the meanest and most contemptible avoidance of his responsibility. Well, I was in public life, I suppose, about the time the noble Lord was born——

LORD HUGH CECIL: I can assure my right hon. friend that I meant nothing disrespectful to him—I meant that he is wanting in what I call political courage. I think he shrinks from meeting this matter in the House of Commons as he ought to meet it.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Sir, my noble friend makes matters worse. Of course I well understood he did not accuse me of want of personal courage. If he thought fit to challenge me to a physical combat in the House of Commons, in spite of my disadvantage of age, I can well understand that he still thinks I should accept the invitation. I have never considered that physical cowardice is the worst quality in man, but I regard moral cowardice as the worst. My noble friend, who has the utmost respect for me, has accused me in this House of moral cowardice. I do not wish to defend myself at any length, and I was saying that I came to public life at a time when the noble Lord was born, and I do not suppose he has had time in his subsequent career to take any account of the record of my work; but if he had I think that the last thing he would have charged me with was any unwillingness or unreadiness to stating in the plainest terms my views, whether at the time they were popular or unpopular, and to take the consequences. If, therefore, it be the fact, as my noble friend says, that I have shrunk from submitting my views to this House, I venture to submit to his charitable consideration that I might have had other reasons for that than a want of moral courage. I object to the Motion of the hon. Member for Banffshire. That Resolution, as it appeared on the Paper, selected not the Ministry as a whole but certain Ministers for approval and by implication condemned certain others. It was, in effect, the reverse of the Motion which was made by the hon. Member for Aberdeenshire some time, I think, in

March. The hon. Member for Aberdeen's Motion condemned certain Ministers. Both hon. Members were either unaware or chose to ignore that constitutional practice which makes the whole Ministry *solidaire*, which implies a certain corporate responsibility for all their acts and opinions—I mean opinions in regard to practical politics. You cannot, therefore, single out a portion of the Government for praise or censure without involving the condemnation of the Government as a whole, and on that ground alone—it is quite a sufficient objection—I object to the Motion of the hon. Member for Banffshire.

I do not wish, for reasons I am going to give, to raise the fiscal question in this House—for reasons other than those so kindly suggested by my noble friend. I do not wish to raise it, and the Amendment I put down is absolutely colourless. It commits the House, if it were carried, only to confidence in the Government, having regard to the statement which the Government have made. No Member voting for my Amendment could possibly have been committed to any view I hold. I spoke as a supporter of the Government and of the Government policy, and I did not go one atom beyond it. It seemed to me that was the proper and natural answer to the Resolution of the hon. Member for Banffshire. I am very glad that the Government have intervened in their own defence. I do not presume to intervene any longer. The Amendment which is proposed on behalf of the Government, I should have said myself—I am not going to discuss it—is a paraphase of the Amendment I proposed. At all events, it conveys exactly the same idea, or, perhaps, I had better say exactly the same two ideas. The first idea is that we have confidence in the Government, and the second is that we, as far as we can, relegate the discussion of the fiscal question which has now been raised to a future Parliament. If the sole object of the hon. Member for Banffshire had been to discuss my policy, my argument would have been different. That was what I ventured to explain to the hon. Member for Greenwich. In that case, if it had been a *bonâ fide* desire to discuss a new fiscal policy, the hon. Member for Banffshire would have omitted all reference to the Government and have treated the question in the shape of an abstract Resolution, condemning on the part of this House the policy I have put forward. That would have been quite legitimate. Whether I should have taken any part in the discussion of my policy, or whether I should have shrunk for reasons of cowardice or any other, I really do not know. All I say is that the the time will come, as it comes to every private Member who proposes a policy, when he will choose to submit it to the House of Commons. As far as I am concerned, and as far as this present movement is concerned, when I spoke twelve months ago on 15th May, I admit I had no idea that so great a storm would have been raised; because my view was that I was raising an important question which deserved the fullest consideration, and which could not be at the moment decided; when I raised it, I distinctly said that I asked for no immediate decision, but the fullest discussion upon it, and that it might be an issue at the general election. I have acted upon that all through. I have not appealed to Parliament because I myself would not be inclined to appeal to Parliament until I thought the question was ripe for its decision. I never have, during the thirty years or so that I have had the honour of a seat in this House, cared much for what are called abstract Resolutions. I have never cared much for that sort of debating-society discussion which after all leads to no practical result. When discussion in the country has shown that the matter is ripe for settlement, then, as it seems to me, is the time to bring it to the great representative Council of the nation and to ask them to give practical effect to what has been shown to be the desire of their constituents. And so I frankly admit to my noble friend I did not desire a discussion in this House, and did not court it, and did not think it would be of the slightest advantage either to my opponents or to myself, that I do not think that a decision either for me or against me would have the slightest influence upon the ultimate decision of the issue, and that, therefore, I do prefer the platform to debate in the House of Commons. It is not that I shrink from debate in the House of Commons, but that I think it is time and labour thrown away. For the moment it seems to me to be entirely premature.

Now, Sir, before I sit down I wish again to make clear to the House what I understand when I vote for this Amendment. I understand that, following the repeated statements of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister, and following also what has always been my own opinion with regard to the propriety of this matter, we do not desire that the question should be discussed, and we do not believe it could be practically discussed, in the present Parliament. We say you may raise the fiscal question if you please, and you may say what you will about it upon a private Member's abstract Resolution; but the Government have pledged themselves not to raise it in any form. The other day my hon. friend the Member for Durham, in a speech upon the Budget, admitted that the Budget was a Budget which might have been proposed by what he called a free-trade Ministry. That is perfectly true. I think he went on to say that he recognised in it evidence of a conviction which had come to my right hon. friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer. Well, Sir, I do not attempt to interpret the views of my right hon. friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer. But I confess that I regarded the Budget, not as proof of altered opinions, but as the carrying out of a definite pledge which, as I understand, has been given, as I certainly should have been willing to give it, if I were still a Minister—that during the present Parliament we should regard this question as only a question for public discussion, and that until public opinion had ripened we should not propose it as a matter for practical statesmanship. If this pledge has been given, as undoubtedly I think it has, I do not know how my hon. friend the Member for Durham could have possibly expected a Budget on any other principles than those of the present Budget. Of course, I reserve to myself the right upon platforms and in those selected audiences which the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich thinks it so easy to obtain, but which he finds it so difficult to meet with himself. I reserve my right in these family parties to explain that if the policy which I recommend had been adopted a very different Budget might have been presented; that there might have been no increase in the tea duty, no increase in the income-tax, and that there might have been an alteration of taxation which might have greatly benefited and increased our trade. But that, Mr. Speaker, is by the way; that is for another audience. When, in my judgment, the proper time comes—and I think it will come sooner than my opponents imagine—my noble friend will find that I shall not in the least shrink from any discussion of the question in this House, for the intelligence of which, the judgment of which, and the representative character of which no one could possibly entertain a higher opinion than myself. Meanwhile I shall reserve myself for my proper duty. I find it heavy enough and my noble friend must forgive me if I refuse to add to it more than is necessary. For the moment I am satisfied with this—that the actual practical policy of the Government which we are called upon to decide is a policy which has my hearty cordial approval, and I most earnestly desire that it should have given to it the time necessary to carry it out. As to the future, however, I may regret that they have not gone further than they have. I do not press them to move a step forward for the moment. All I ask is, as I should ask of any Government of sensible men, that they should not pledge themselves beforehand against circumstances which they cannot foresee. If circumstances are as they were at the time when I left the Government I should not be the one to blame them for remaining absolutely tied to the programme they have put before the country. But if circumstances have changed—not to be controversial, I say they may change—then I think it would be foolish of them, as it would be foolish of anybody else, that they should find their hands tied by expressions of opinion which those who are not too friendly towards them are endeavouring prematurely to extract from them.

*Lord **GEORGE HAMILTON** (Middlesex, Ealing): I should not have taken part in this debate if it had not been for an expression which fell from my right hon. friend the Member for West Birmingham. He informed the House and the Unionist Party that for the next year or two he would avoid the discussion of the fiscal question in Parliament, and devote himself to discussing it upon the public platform. Very well. If my right hon. friend is going to devote his ability and energy, and what, I admit, is his immense interest, to the discussion of this question, I want the Prime Minister, and, above all, the Unionist Party, to have a few moments reflection upon what that means. I am a very humble member of the Unionist Party. I left the Government at the same time as my right hon. friend, and I left it because I was confident that the agitation which my right hon. friend was promoting, if it attained certain dimensions, must lead to one of two results—either this country would be committed to protection or else the Unionist Party would be smashed to pieces. I have always regretted that hon. Gentlemen opposite and the Radical Party generally have chosen to associate my right hon. friend's action in this matter with low, personal, or sordid motives. I give my right hon. friend credit for the highest motives, both National and Imperial. He has been animated throughout by a sincere desire to do his best for the Empire generally, and for that part which, for the time being, was under his personal control. But it is perfectly clear to my right hon. friend the Prime Minister that the country will not have protection. There always has been a strong protectionist element in the Conservative Party. No men knew that better than Lord Beaconsfield and Lord Salisbury; and both of those distinguished predecessors of the Prime Minister kept those tendencies in order. Now my right hon. friend the Member for West Birmingham has lit a flame which he cannot quench, and which the Prime Minister cannot quench. And the result is that from top to bottom of the Unionist Party there is discord and dissension in almost every constituency in the country. I venture to say—I have spent a great part of my life studying this question, and I have not often been wrong in my forecasts — in all seriousness to my hon. friends behind me that if this agitation is pursued on the lines on which it has been carried on during the past year, whenever the general election takes place the heaviest defeat on record awaits the Unionist Party. And, I ask, who will be responsible for that defeat? We, who throughout have endeavoured to warn the Government of the dangers which were ahead, or those who have recklessly led them on to the path which can but end in the almost total annihilation of our Party? Then, assuming there was, as I believe there will be, this heavy defeat of the Unionist Party, if protection is hung around the neck of that Party after defeat it will be a millstone on it for years and years.

My right hon. friend the Member for West Birmingham says this Motion is a censure on the Government because it only alludes to certain members of the Government. Of course it only alludes to certain members of the Government; because everybody knows that the Government is composed partly of protectionists and partly of free-traders, and the Prime Minister has done his best to hold the balance because he, naturally impressed with the responsibilities of his position, wishes to keep his Government and his Party together. But though my right hon. friend the Prime Minister professes himself a free-trader, in every controversy which has arisen since the beginning of the session the bias of the Government has always been thrown in on behalf of the protectionists. In the first debate that took place on the Address, an admirable speech was made by the President of the Board of Trade. Practically all his his conclusions were contradicted by three speeches subsequently made by three members of the Government. In the next discussion that took place the hon. Member for Ripon tabled an Amendment which was distasteful to my hon. friends the protectionists, and it was withdrawn. And now to-night a Motion is made which seemed to be absolutely immaculate, though I cannot apply the same phrase to the speech in which the hon. Member opposite introduced it—a Motion in which there was not the slightest sound or note of censure on the Government; a Motion which expresses all my right hon. friend's Sheffield policy. [HON. MEMBERS: No.] I say "Yes," because the Sheffield policy was composed of two parts—the negative and the positive. The negative part was a perfectly clear and distinct repudiation of the taxation of food. The positive part was somewhat obscure. It was some particular form of retaliation, which no doubt, in the course of time, my right hon. friend will be able to develop.

I wish the Government to remain in office provided that their continuance of tenure of office is not associated with the dissemination of protectionist principles among the Unionist Party. It has been my pride to be associated with that Party for many years past. I came into the House of Commons at a time when the Conservative Party was at a very low ebb; but under the judicious leadership of Lord Beaconsfield and Lord Salisbury it gradually became a prominent Party, a National Party, and finally an Imperial Party. I do not want to see that Party shattered to pieces. But while we are to have peace and no discussion in this House, what is going on in the constituencies? In these constituencies, no matter what the services of the Member may be, no matter how loyally he may have served his Party or done work for the Unionist cause, if he will not accept wholesale these new heresies he is "shunted," with the result almost in every case that the seat will be lost to the Party to which he belongs. In this House the reverse tactics are adopted. When a Motion is brought forward on fiscal questions the merits of it are not to be considered, but the political opinions upon other questions of its promoter; and so two absolutely antagonistic principles are in operation, one in the constituencies and one in the House of Commons. I know what the Prime Minister's troubles are, and the worries he has to contend with. I know the singular complications and difficulties against which he has had to fight his way, but I do implore him to speak out plainly and to tell us what is his policy, what it is the Government will support and what it is they will not support. Depend upon it, unless he adopts this policy, though these devices and delays may give to the Government an increased tenure of office, they can only result in smashing to pieces the Party of which he is the head.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: My noble friend has made an appeal to me which seems to come strangely, as far as I can form an estimate of the matter, from his lips or from the lips of any man who has taken the trouble to make himself acquainted with the utterances, and I am afraid the somewhat lengthy utterances, I have made in the country on the subject of fiscal reform. I may be unfortunate in my method of expression. I can only say that I have done my best to make myself clear. If I have not been understood it must be either owing to a fault on the part of those to whom I have addressed myself or from want of capacity of lucid exposition on my own part. I need hardly say that I accept the more polite and the second of these hypotheses. I am not quite ready to acknowledge that I may have failed to convey my meaning on this subject to a large number of Gentlemen who profess to have studied my speeches and writings. I apologise to them for my shortcomings; but how, may I ask, when the difficulty arises from this initial defect, am I to cure it? My noble friend has asked for a further exposition of my policy in addition to what I have written and what I have said at Sheffield, at Bristol, Manchester, on at least two occasions during the course of the present session, and to what I said in certain speeches last session. In spite of these utterances my noble friend is still unable to understand my point of view. I am sure that it is not his fault; but I am also sure that where I have tried so persistently and with great expenditure of time and trouble on my part to make my meaning plain on these numerous occasions, it is hardly likely that the sixth or seventh effort will be more successful than the others. I can only assure my noble friend that the policy which is commonly described as the Sheffield policy is still my policy. I have seen since that speech was made no reason to add to it, no reason to detract from it, and it still represents the advice which I would give to the country were I called upon to-morrow to frame an election address. I cannot expect him to feel satisfied with the substance of that observation; but I hope he will feel that I have made all the response it is in my power to make, and that if there is an obscurity in defining the doctrines, it is an obscurity which my unfortunate deficiencies make it impossible for me to correct.

I do not mean in the brief observations that I intend to address to the House to deal with the fiscal problem beyond what I have already said—and for this reason, that the chief object and motive of the Amendment which I have put upon the Paper is to express my individual opinion and the opinion of my colleagues that these discussions on the fiscal question are discussions on purely abstract questions, which may be innocent, which may possibly be beneficial, but which I do not think excite much interest unless there is an attack either upon the Government or upon an individual behind me. I do not think hon. Members understand me; I will express what I mean. Unless there is some attack on the Government involved in a Motion, as my right hon. friend the Member for West Bristol stated with unanswerable truth, you would not see these Benches packed, they would be as empty as they were during our discussions on the great question of national economy. Now, Sir, I think the only person who has made any case for the suggestion that this Motion does not affect His Majesty's Government is my noble friend the Member for Greenwich. He tried to make out that the Government had, with great want of tact, intervened in the lists in which there was going to be a duel to the death between himself and my right hon. friend the Member for Birmingham. I do not agree with that statement of my noble friend's; but I cannot pass from his speech without expressing my profound regret at the quite unnecessary methods which he introduced into his treatment of what I understood was a scientific and economic question. Nobody has, I think, ever accused my noble friend of want of courage. I do not know that this House is lacking in men of courage, but certainly there is no man of greater courage than my noble friend in this House, and it has usually been thought to be an attribute of those who possess courage that they are prepared to recognise that great quality in others. Many accusations have been made against my right hon. friend the Member for Birmingham. To attack him appears always to be regarded as in order and relevant to any debate, on any subject, Imperial or local, foreign or domestic. The utmost ingenuity of hostility, which sometimes, I grieve to say, has risen to malignity, has been used to vilify him, and yet, in all the vocabulary of attack which I have ever heard levelled against him, I have never until this evening heard it even whispered that the quality that he was lacking in was courage.

I had hoped to be quite uncontroversial in the remarks that I was going to make to-night, but in what I have just said I have been provoked by the course of the discussion, not to go beyond the proprieties of debate, but to be more controversial than I contemplated when I came down to the House to listen to the speech of the hon. Gentleman the Member for Banffshire. [A VOICE: You did not listen to him.] The House does me gross injustice. I may have missed the exordium of the hon. Gentleman's speech, but I can assure him that I was not so far lacking in Parliamentary manners as to put down an Amendment to his Motion without taking pains to listen, at all events, to the major part of his address. I am only sorry I was not observed. It may be asked why a course which I admit to be unusual has been adopted by the Government in this case; and I will frankly tell the House that it is because, in my opinion, this was not a Motion—couched in the terms which we saw upon the Paper and supported by the speeches which have been delivered in its favour—to which the Government could regard themselves as indifferent. If we were not to regard ourselves as indifferent it was desirable that we should take an opportunity of expressing our views as to the inexpediency of these constant efforts, made from motives quite natural, pardonable, and even praiseworthy on the part of hon. Gentleman opposite, to embarrass the Government and to invent differences even where differences do not exist among their opponents—efforts which are based upon a view of Parliamentary government which would absolutely destroy that government if it were allowed to lead to its natural and almost inevitable conclusion. After all, here we are in this country governed on the Party system and by Cabinet government. That inevitably involves the co-operation of a large number of independent individuals who if they do not act together are perfectly impotent, but who, if they do act together, must necessarily make concessions one to the other, and must not present themselves before an astonished country as isolated units with opinions never to be modified in practice by any considerations of the greater common object which binds them all together, and by the necessities inevitable to any free form of institution which is not to fall to pieces amid universal derision. If that be true what does it involve? That you must not ask a greater degree of unanimity among any body of men acting together than is required for their common action. It is impossible that on all subjects, human and divine, religious, political, connected with domestic policy, foreign policy, and all the infinite complexity of questions that come before this House, every individual belonging to one Party or to one Cabinet is always to have not only the same general outlook, but precisely the same shade of opinion. You cannot work the system on that theory.

Well, what do all these discussions of fiscal policy point to? Do they point to anything which has to be done this session? Or to anything which has to be done next session, or in any succeeding session of the present Parliament? By common consent they have no relation to anything which we have been elected to this House to carry out. Have they any relation to the next Parliament? I understand from my noble friend that he anticipates that the general election will not only lead to a reversal of the present balance of political power, but that the Unionist Party will receive a smashing and a crushing defeat. Well, then, it will not be heard of in the next Parliament; so that we are actually asked, not for the first time, for the second, or for the third time in the course of the present session, to pass what is practically equivalent to a vote of censure upon the Government in respect of a question which is not to be dealt with by the Government in the present Parliament, nor in the next Parliament unless that Government is to be returned to power—which, you tell us, it will not be. Well, supposing this smashing defeat takes place to which my noble friend so confidently looks forward, and to which I gather hon. Gentlemen opposite look forward with more satisfaction and with equal confidence, another Government will come in—a great united Government—which will last for five or six years. I take their own estimates, and I think I am moderate when I say six. Very well. There remain then the present session, let us say the next session, two years. Add six to that and we have eight years. Then we have been occupied four or five times in the course of the present session in passing votes of censure upon the Government for what that Government is going to do eight years hence.

Well, I do not merely quarrel with that, because I think it is extremely ridiculous. I quarrel with it for a much more serious reason, and one which truly ought to appeal to hon. Gentlemen opposite much more than to hon. Gentlemen on this side of the House. They will admit—I do not want to put a controversial edge on anything I say—but they will admit that through many generations divisions in the Liberal Party have, for reasons well known to all who have studied the subject, been more profound than all those which divide our Party. Both Parties, of course, have had very serious divisions. We were broken up temporarily upon the Catholic Emancipation Act in 1828, which had a very important bearing on what subsequently happened in the great Reform Bill. We were again broken up over the Corn Laws in 1846; and there have been no doubt other cases, though not, so far as I remember, of equal magnitude. But a condition of division of opinion is chronic with hon. Gentlemen opposite. I do not mean to say it to their discredit, but a couple of generations or more ago the Whig element and the Radical element were always fighting like cat and dog within the Party and the Cabinet, and since then there have been new divisions to which I will not refer, but which are not of less magnitude and importance, and seem to me likely to be as permanent in their character. Now if this House is going to say there shall not be a Party acting together during a Parliament, nor a Cabinet allowed to sit together to manage the affairs of the country unless every member of that Party and every member of that Cabinet are going to say not merely, "We support this or that practical policy," but "for all time we pledge ourselves to this or that particular dogma; for all time we promise this and we promise that; for all time we are to be bound by principles going to the root of every public matter, varying not a shred," why, then, I do not believe that you can manage any Party on those principles, but I am quite sure you will never manage the Liberal Party. Therefore I would respectfully give the advice to the House which I have endeavoured to embody in the Amendment which stands in my name.

That Amendment, Sir, asks no man to express an opinion one way or the other, and is deliberately intended to ask no man to express an opinion one way or the other on the fiscal question, for the simple reason that the fiscal question is not before the present Parliament and that it will not matter one jot either to the constituencies or to the next Parliament what view this Parliament happens to take on the subject. But it does suggest that we ought to refuse to discuss matters like these which are either abstract and relatively academic—I do not object to their being discussed so long as they are academic, but we ought not to discuss them so long as to their academic character there is added something, as there undoubtedly is on the present occasion, in the shape of an attack upon the Government or any section of the Government's supporters. I understand that the hon. Gentleman prides himself on having expressed, in more felicitous language, the same doctrines as I endeavoured clumsily to embody in the Sheffield speech. I do not know that I prefer his redaction to mine, even in the matter of the importation of food; but I would remind him that the views expressed in the Sheffield programme on the importation of food were but a small part of the views which I then laid before the country, and the hon. Gentleman has entirely refused to make any reference in this laudatory Motion of his to the scheme as a whole. He has isolated and not very happily expressed a particular portion of it. He has combined that with an attack by implication, a wholly undeserved attack, on many of my colleagues; and we are, therefore, forced to take part in dealing with the matter; and, in my opinion, the only part which we can take with dignity is to say that Motions like this, discussions like this, upon a question not before the House during the present session, not to be before the House in the next session, not to be before this House in any session at all, should be in the interests of Parliamentary government as a whole left on one side. I do not speak simply in the interests of the present Government. Of course, I do speak in their interests, but I say I do not speak solely in their interests. I believe the whole method to be wrong, and that if we are really to remain what we have been, a great assembly, worked upon the Party system with Governments which can rely upon a majority to support their policy as long as that policy is approved, then the methods of the hon. Gentleman are wrong, and those who support him on this side of the House are, as I think, inflicting not merely an injury upon the Government which many of them at all events desire to support, but an injury upon Parliamentary government as a whole. Those observations I address respectfully, but most sincerely and earnestly, to both sides of the House.

The only remaining topic interests, I admit, my friends on this side and them only. We have put down a Motion asking the House to do two things, to put aside these vain controversies which affect this Parliament not at all, and to express their confidence in the Government and in the policy which the Government are endeavouring to pursue. If we have that confidence, if the measures that we have introduced at home, if the administrative reforms which we desire to carry out, for instance, in the Army, if the colonial policy and the foreign policy—of course they do not approve themselves to hon. Gentlemen opposite—but if they approve themselves, as I believe they do, to hon. Gentlemen on this side of the House, then we ask them to give us that support without which of course it would be vain for us even for twenty-four hours longer to endeavour to carry on the business of the country. If they do not give us that support, willingly do we give up the responsibilities and the labours of office. But all those on this side of the House who think that there are still useful functions that we can perform, who think that a change of policy either at home or abroad might be fraught with disaster to what we, at all events, consider the dearest interests of the nation would surely be acting the most foolish of all parts if, because years hence, as it may be, they differ from something which may be proposed by a possible future Government, they were to bring to a summary conclusion labours undertaken in their interests, and, as we sincerely hope, not in their interests alone, but in the interests of the Empire and the nation at large.

MR. ASQUITH (Fifeshire, E.): We have witnessed to-night an interesting domestic discussion; and those of us who do not belong, as I do not, to the happy household opposite have been content, and I think wisely content, to occupy for the most part the position of silent, though interested, spectators. I do not profess myself to be solicitous for the union of the Unionist Party; but I am solicitous—as I hope most of us on this side, and some, at any rate, on the other side, are—for two things; for the cause of free trade and for the credit of the House of Commons. And it seems to me that, in the speech which the Prime Minister has just delivered, he has entirely ignored both those points. He has completely underrated the magnitude of the issue which his Amendment raises. We, on this side, at any rate, cannot look on the proposal of this Amendment as an isolated proceeding; we recall the successive stages of a long and, as we think, not very creditable game of shifts and surprises which has been played upon us during the last twelve months. The time at my disposal is short, but I am going to make use of very plain language. I tell the right hon. Gentleman, speaking for this side of the House, that to our minds this is only the latest of a series of steps by which he has sought—he, the Prime Minister of this country and the Leader of this House—to evade Parliamentary discussion, to shuffle off Ministerial responsibility, and to degrade and flout the House of Commons.

In order to substantiate that statement, let me review very briefly one or two of the landmarks on the road we have travelled. When this controversy arose a year ago, the Government, being then in exclusive possession and control of the time of the House, refused to allow any debate upon a vote of censure. [MINISTERIAL cheers.] Yes; censure of what? Censure of a policy which in the same breath they told us they had not yet framed, because at that time they were engaged in trying to make up their own minds. I will not refer to the events of the autumn because they do not affect Parliament; but when we reassembled here at the beginning of this year we hoped in the debate on the Address to come at last to a clear understanding of the Government policy. What happened? Minister after Minister rose from the Treasury Bench, and they presented in turn every conceivable view of the fiscal question, but they all relied on the unfortunate absence of the Prime Minister as an excuse for giving no intelligible definition of their general and corporate opinion. The right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister has said that the Sheffield programme is plain enough to any man in the street. All I can say is that not one of his colleagues could understand it, if by understanding you mean not merely intellectual apprehension, which is a thing that goes on inside a man's head, but the capacity for articulate expression. I agree that at the close of the debate there was a flash of welcome light shot across the scene from a wholly unexpected quarter. On the very eve of the division the Home Secretary, who had delivered not the least cryptic of the Delphic utterances from that Bench, in response to an appeal from an anxious and undecided supporter, told us in plain terms that the Government was opposed to any duty on raw material or food. But it soon appeared that in making that statement he had reckoned without his host; for when a few weeks later it was embodied, as we supposed, with the knowledge and connivance of the Government in a celebrated Amendment, that Amendment was mysteriously smuggled out of existence at the instance of the friends of the Member for West Birmingham. That same declaration is repeated in the Motion of my hon. friend to-night; and the question I want to put to the Government, to the House, and to the country, is this, Why is it not accepted by the Government? This is not a vote of censure, unless, as my hon. friend said earlier in the evening, it be a vote of censure to select for approval a declaration made by a responsible Minister, ostensibly on behalf of his colleagues. It is a tribute such as the House of Commons rarely offers. It is a spontaneous tribute, an unsolicited tribute, a tribute which proceeds from both sides of the House.

If it is not accepted by the Government, what is the reason? I think I can supply the answer. There is one reason, and one reason only. It is because the Government are afraid to accept it. They are afraid, in the first instance, to define any policy at all. They are still more afraid to approve of what may be construed as a declaration in favour of free trade; and they are most afraid of all to seem even by implication to condemn the Birmingham policy. The only inference I can draw is that it is for the same reason and in deference to the same influences that my hon. friend's Motion is to be burked to-night, as the bowstring was secretly applied to the Wharton Amendment a few weeks ago. I agree with the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham—and I am afraid it is the only part of his speech with which I do agree—that there is no real or substantial distinction between the Amendment of the Prime Minister and the Amendment which he himself put on the Paper. They are both suterfuges. They are expressed, I agree, in language of varying ambiguity; they proceed, I agree, by more or less devious routes; but they have one common object, and that object is once more to prevent this House of Commons from declaring itself against the protective taxation of food. Speaking, as I said I would, first of all in the cause of free trade, I object to this Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman, and I ask the House to reject it, because it is a capitulation to the Birmingham policy. But I speak also, if I may venture to do so, for the credit of the House of Commons; and I assert in all seriousness and with all deliberation that this Amendment of the Prime Minister's is an affront to the House of Commons. It is an act of nothing less than arrogance for any Minister—I do not care who he is—to come down here and propose that this House should by its own declaration disable itself for the whole term of its natural life—for that is what the Amendment amounts to—from taking any cognisance of that which has become an issue of paramount importance to this country and the Empire. Yes, Sir, and by whom is this claim made? The claim is made by the Leader of the House of Commons, the man who before all others ought to be sensitive to its rights and its duties, and jealous of its powers. ["He is."] Is he? What is he doing? He is asking that upon a capital question of domestic and Imperial policy this House shall for the rest of its existence sit here with muzzled mouth, fettered hands, and paralysed authority. And why? Is this claim made, is this proposition put forward for any great or worthy purpose? Is it in the defence of any high principle? Is it in pursuit of any noble cause? Nothing of the kind. It is put forward for no better and no more respectable reason than to keep together for a little longer in nominal and ostensible unity, men who are fundamentally divided in opinions, and to postpone in the interest of a discredited Ministry during a few more ignominious weeks or months the inevitable judgment of the nation.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 251; Noes, 306; (Division List No. 127.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork,N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ambrose, Robert
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt.Hn.HerbertHenry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beaumont, Wentworth, C. B.
Beckett, Ernest William
Bell, Richard
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Bowles, T. Gibson (KingsLynn)
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Brigg, John
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carvill, Patrick Geo.Hamilton
Causton, Richard Knight
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cawley, Frederick
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Channing, Francis Allston
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clancy, John Joseph
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron(Glasgow)
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Delany, William
Devlin, Charles Ramsay(G'lw'y
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobbie, Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellice, CaptEC(StAndrw'sBghs
Elliot, Hn. A. Ralph Douglas
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Evans, Sir F. H. (Maidstone)
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Field, William
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmund
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Michael(Lond.Univ.
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Fuller, J. M. F.
Furness, Sir Christopper
Gladstone, Rt. Hn.Herbert J.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hain, Edward
Harcourt, Louis V. (Rosendale)
Harcourt, RtHnSirW(Monmth
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayter, Rt. Hn. Sir Arthur D.
Healy, Timothy Michael
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hn. Charles H.
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)
Hobhouse, Rt.Hn.H.(SomersE
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife,West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Joicey, Sir James
Jones,David Brynmor(Swansea
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kemp, Lieut.-Colonel George
Kilbride, Denis
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Langley, Batty
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leamy, Edmund
Leese, Sir Joseph F(Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Logan, John William
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M‘Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M‘Crae, George
M‘Hugh, Patrick A.
M‘Kean, John
M‘Kenna, Reginald
M‘Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
M‘Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mellor, Rt. Hn. John William
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Mooney, John J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Morley, Rt. Hn. John (Montr'se
Moss, Samuel
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Newnes, Sir George
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil WilliamW
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Brien, Kendal (TipperaryMd
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)

O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, James(RoscommonN.
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Palmer, Sir Charles M(Durham)
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Pemberton, John S. G.
Philipps, John Wynford
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, Charles E.
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)
Seely, Maj. J.E.B.(IsleofWight
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Slack, John Bamford
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C.R.(Northants
Steventon, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, David A. (Merthyr)
Thomas, J.A (Glamorg'n Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York. W.R.)
Tillet, Louis John
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Wallace, Robert
Walton, John Lawson(Leeds,S.
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney)
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse, Sir J. T.(Huddersfd
Younger, William
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Black and Mr. Goschen.

NOES.

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Aird, Sir John
Allhusen, Augustus Hy. Eden
Allsopp, Hon. George
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, RtHn HughO.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, RtHnSir H.
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt.Hn.A.J.(Manch'r)
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, RtHnGeraldW.(Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banes, Major George Edward
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benj'min
Beach, Rt.Hn.SirMichaelHicks
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, Lt.-Col.H.F(Middlesex
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brown, Sir Alex. H. (Shropsh.)
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Campbell, J.H.M.(Dublin Univ
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V.C.W.(Derybshire)
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt.Hon.J.(Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt.Hn.J.A.(W'rc
Chamberlayne, T. (S'thampton
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Rt.Hn. Sir John C. R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cox, Irwin Edw. Bainbridge
Craig, Charles Curtis(Antrim,S.
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cross, Herb. Shepherd(Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Davies, Sir HoratioD(Chatham
Dewar, Sir T.R.(Tower Hamlts
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt.Hn.SirJoseph C.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, SirFredDixon
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt.Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Dyke, Rt.Hon.SirWilliamHart
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fergusson, Rt.Hn.SirJ.(Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Firbank, Sir Joseph Thomas
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir RobertPenrose-
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick,S.W
Fyler, John Arthur
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gordon, Hn.J.E.(Elgin&Nairn)
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Gordon, Maj.Evans (T'r H'mlets
Gore, Hon. S.F. Ormsby- (Linc.
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Green, WalfordD.(Wednesbury
Greene, SirEW(BurySEdm'nds
Greene, HenryD.(Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Hall, Edward Marshall

Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton,Marq.of(L'nd'nd'rry)
Hardy, Laurence(Kent,Ashf'rd
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th
Harris, Dr. Fredk. R.(Dulwich)
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard(Hanley
Heath, James (Staffords, N.W.
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford,W.
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Horner, Frederick William
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, J. (Kent, Faversham)
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Hozier, Hn. James Hen. Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Hutton, John (Yorks. N.R.)
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hn. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Capt. Herbert Merton
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Kennaway, Rt. Hon.SirJohnH.
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T.(Denbigh
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W.(Salop)
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
Knowles, Sir Lees
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, SirJoseph (Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, J. Grant (Yorks. N.R.
Lee, ArthurH.(Hants.Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W.(Evesh'm
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol,S)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., (Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
McCalmont, Colonel James
McIver,Sir Lewis (EdinburghW
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell, RtHnSirH.E(Wigt'n)
Maxwell, W.J.H(Dumfriesshire
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Middlemore,John Throgmorton
Milner, Rt. Hon. Sir Fredk. G.
Mitchell, William (Burnley)
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montague, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants
Moore, William
Morgan,David J.(Walthamstow
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Rt Hn A.Graham(Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Herbert P. (Darlington)
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Pym, C. Guy
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliffe, R. F.
Rattigan, Sir William Henry
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, Hon. M.W.(Stalybridge
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Gr.
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Rothschild, Hn. Lionel Walter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford. W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, SirHarryS(Limehouse)
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos.Hyles
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Saunderson, Rt.Hn.Col.Edw.J.
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, Sir H.(Renfrew)
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Abel H.(Hereford, East)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley,Hon.Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Edw. Jas. (Somerset)
Stanley, Rt. Hn. Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn.J.G(Ox'fdUniv.
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col.SirCEH(Sheffield)
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walrond, Rt.Hn.SirWilliamH.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt.-Col.A.C.E.(Taunt'n
Welby,Sir Charles G.E.(Notts.)
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon-
Whiteley, H.(Ashton und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York,E.R.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, SirW.H.(Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt.Hn E.R.(Bath)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE NOES.—Sir Alexander Acland - Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

Question proposed, "That these words be there added."

And, it being after Midnight, and objection being taken to further Proceeding, the debate stood adjourned.

Adjourned at a quarter after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Thursday, 19th May, 1904.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with:—Water Orders Confirmation [H.L.]; Gas and Water Orders Confirmation [H.L.]; Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 3) [H.L.].

The same were ordered to lie on the Table.

Derwent Valley Water Board Bill [H.L.]. Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments.

Belfast Corporation (Tramways) Bill [H.L.]. Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments.

Newcastle and Gateshead Water Bill [H.L.]. Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments.

Lothians Electric Power Bill [H.L.]. Reported, with Amendments.

Liverpool and Wigan Churches Bill [H.L.]. Reported, with Amendments.

Gosport Water Bill [H.L.]. Commons Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Great Central Railway Bill. Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Five Lords appointed a Select Committee on the Bristol Tramways (Extensions) Bill [H.L.] and other Bills, do form the Select Committee for the consideration of the Great Central Railway Bill; read, and agreed to. All petitions referred to the Committee, with leave to the petitioners praying to be heard by counsel against the Bill to be heard as desired, as also counsel for the Bill.

Baker Street and Waterloo Railway Bill. The order made on Tuesday last appointing certain Lords the Select Committee to consider the Bill, discharged.

Baker Street and Waterloo Railway Bill. Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Five Lords appointed a Select Committee on the Manchester Corporation (General Powers) Bill [H.L.] and other Bills, do form the Select Committee for the consideration of the Baker Street and Waterloo Railway Bill; read, and agreed to. All petitions referred to the Committee, with leave to the petitioners praying to be heard by counsel against the Bill to be heard as desired, as also counsel for the Bill.

BARNET DISTRICT GAS AND WATER BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Acting Chairman of Committees.*)

THE EARL OF VERULAM: My Lords, this Bill will be opposed in Committee, and I shall not, therefore, divide the House upon it now; but there is one clause in the Bill with regard to the sale of water which is a very serious one for Hertfordshire. I believe there are many petitions against this clause, and it will be necessary, if Hertfordshire is to have the sources of supply which are its right and its due, that this part of the Bill should be deleted. I do not move any Amendment at this stage, but merely draw attention to the matter.

On Question, Motion agreed to.

Bill: Read 2ª, and committed. The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

Crystal Palace District Gas Bill. Read 2ª, and committed.

Great Western Railway Bill [H.L.]; Filey Improvement Bill [H.L.]. Read 3ª, and passed, and sent to the Commons.

Amersham, Beaconsfield, and District Water Bill. Read 3ª, and passed.

St. Marylebone Electric Lighting Bill. Read 3ª, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

Brymbo Water Bill; London and India Docks Company Bill. Brought from the Commons; read 1^a; and referred to the Examiners.

Cambrian Railways Bill [H.L.]; Nuneaton and Chilvers Coton Urban District Council Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with amendments. The said Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Harlow and Sawbridgeworth Gas Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments.

Ryde Gas Bill. Returned from the Commons with the Amendment agreed to.

Blyth and Cowpen Gas Bill; Whitby Gas Bill. Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill; Local Government Provisional Order (Poor Law) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill. Read 2^a (according to order), and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Thursday the 9th of June next.

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [H.L.]; Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [H.L.]. Read 2^a (according to order).

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (Birmingham) Bill [H.L.]. House in Committee (according to order). Bill reported without amendment; Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3^a on Tuesday the 7th of June next.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 1) Bill [H.L.]. Read 3^a (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons.

PRIVATE AND PROVISIONAL ORDER CONFIRMATION BILLS.

Ordered, That Standing Orders Nos. 92 and 93 be suspended; and that the time for depositing Petitions praying to be heard against Private and Provisional Order Confirmation Bills, also the time for depositing Documents relating to any Order under The Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, which would otherwise expire during the adjournment of the House at Whitsuntide, be extended to the first day on which the House shall sit after the Recess.

PETITIONS.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES (METRIC SYSTEM) BILL [H.L.].

Petition in favour of; of Durham County Council; read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Regulations of the Board of Education, dated 13th May, 1904, providing for grants on account of the education of defective and epileptic children, and prescribing conditions to be fulfilled by certified schools for such children.

TRADE REPORTS—I. ANNUAL SERIES.

No. 3164. France (French Indo-China).

No. 3165. Spain (Galicia, Asturias, Leon).

No. 3166. Greece (Piræus and District)

No. 3167. Persia (Kerman and District).

II. MISCELLANEOUS SERIES.

No. 609. Germany (Technical Instruction in Naval Architecture and Engineering.

COMMERCIAL, No. 4 (1904).

Suez Canal. Returns of shipping and tonnage, 1901, 1902, and 1903 (in continuation of Commercial, No. 4, 1903).

CHINA, No. 3 (1904).

Despatch from His Majesty's Minister at Pekin enclosing a report by Mr. George J. Kidston on a journey in Mongolia.

AFRICA, No. 6 (1904).

Convention between the United Kingdom and China respecting the employment of Chinese labour in British Colonies and Protectorates; signed at London, 13th May, 1904.

HARBOURS OF REFUGE.

Memorandum, by Commander G. C. Frederick, R.N., on the question of constructing a harbour of refuge on the north coast of Cornwall.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

FOREIGN JURISDICTION ACT.

Order in Council of the 16th May, 1904, entitled "The Bechuanaland Protectorate (Lands) Order in Council, 1904."

INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION (IRELAND).

Rules and programme of examinations for 1905.

SUPERANNUATION.

Treasury Minute, dated 14th May, 1904, declaring that Henry Floodgate Taffs, Principal Foreman Writer, Woolwich Arsenal, War Department, was appointed without a Civil Service certificate through inadvertence on the part of the head of his Department.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

LIGHT RAILWAYS BILL [H.L.].

A Bill to continue and amend the Light Railways Act, 1896—Was presented by the Lord Wolverton; read 1^a; and to be printed. (No. 83.)

PEVENTION OF CORRUPTION BILL [H.L.].

Read 3^a (according to order); an Amendment (Privilege) made; Bill passed, and sent to the Commons.

BILLS OF EXCHANGE ACT, 1882, AMENDMENT BILL [H.L.]; PRIZE COURTS BILL [H.L.].

Read 3^a (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons.

STREET BETTING BILL [H.L.].

Amendments reported (according to order), and Bill to be read 3^a on Tuesday the 7th of June next.

COTTON AS CONTRABAND OF WAR.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (The Marquess of LANSDOWNE): My Lords, I was questioned the night before last by my noble friend Lord Avebury in regard to a recently issued proclamation by the Russian Government under which cotton was declared to be contraband of war. I told my noble friend that I would make inquiries in regard to the actual terms of the proclamation, and I am now able to say that we have heard from our representative at St. Petersburg that the notification only applies to raw cotton suitable for the manufacture of explosives, and not to piece-goods. I make this statement at the suggestion of Lord Avebury, who is not able to be in the House this afternoon.

THE IMPERIAL YEOMANRY.

*LORD LOVAT: My Lords, I rise in accordance with the notice standing in my name on the Paper, to call attention to the proposed reduction of the strength of the Imperial Yeomanry units. The proposal of the War Office is to reduce the force by 120 men per battalion. I should like the noble Earl the Under-Secretary of State for War to give us the reason why this reduction has been proposed, and to state, if it is necessary to insist on this reduction, whether it will not be possible to make some slight modification in the order. I regret to have to make any criticism of the War Office at the present moment, when they are occupied with so many great and drastic reforms, many of which will undoubtedly put the Army on a much better footing, but I think that a matter which affects the whole of one of the branches of is Majesty's service cannot be regarded as a mere detail.

It must be remembered that we have experienced a great many changes in the Yeomanry establishment in the last few years. Just before the South African war the Yeomanry were only 12,000 strong, and were, to all appearance, a moribund force. At the beginning of the war so little confidence was placed in them that those Yeomen who went to the front had themselves to provide a large portion of their kit. At the later stages of the war, however, His Majesty's Government could not get hold of too many Yeomen. Immediately after the war ceased the establishment of the Yeomanry was raised to 35,000, and great efforts were made by Yeomanry colonels to raise the force up to the numbers required. Last year the long-expected Yeomanry regulations were published, and, to the horror of those interested in the force, they contained the provision that unless a Yeomanry regiment reached 420 strong it would be liable to disbandment. This year there has been a further revolution. Instead of any idea to keep the force up, the idea seems to be to keep it down. If a commanding officer had over 476 men, having made every effort to get up to the previous strength of 590, he was not until yesterday, when it was notified that the order had been rescinded, to be allowed to receive anything in respect of those men over strength. The rescission of this order is, at all events, a slight modification in the interests of the Yeomanry.

One cannot regard favourably any changes of policy in respect to the Auxiliary Forces unless they are to meet an urgent need. The Auxiliary Forces depend to a very great degree on patriotic sentiment. Those who take part in conducting them are usually very much out of pocket, and the changes of policy which the Auxiliary Forces have suffered from have led to considerable disappointment in all ranks. It is all very well to dismiss War Office officials at less than a butler's notice, but members of the Auxiliary Forces, who have not a profession to aim at and no ties to keep them in those forces, cannot be treated in this manner. There are many reasons why the reduction of the Imperial Yeomanry establishment is unadvisable. According to the military textbooks, infantry will suffer in war unless there is at least one mounted man to every six foot soldiers. At present the Imperial Yeomanry establishment is 34,000 strong, and as the Volunteers number 348,000 and the Militia 120,000, this gives one mounted man to every twelve infantry. Apart from military policy there are other reasons why the present moment is not an opportune one for a reduction in the mounted forces of the Empire. First of all, there is a larger proportion of the cavalry regiments in South Africa than there has been before, except during the war, thereby reducing the number in this country. Again, we are aware of the importance of Mounted Infantry, yet one of the most scathing of the criticisms of the Germans in their review of the war was directed to this principle of our mounted infantry taking, as they aptly said, the best men and the best officers from a regiment, thereby lowering the *morale* of the remainder.

There is a further reason why the Imperial Yeomanry at this moment should not be reduced—it is that the force possesses 25,000 horses trained in the ranks. I do not think that our experience of the Remount Department during the South African War was such that the War Office can afford to give away the chance of obtaining 25,000 horses trained in the ranks in case of war. I cannot think that the proposed reduction is due to any dissatisfaction with the work of Yeomanry officers; but I would point out that majors and senior officers of the Yeomanry have not had a chance of being trained to the standard that they should be trained. At the present moment there is no school for senior Yeomanry officers, and those Yeomanry officers who attend school have to go back to squad drill, although they may be experienced officers who have served for years in a branch of His Majesty's Regular Forces. Nor can I think that the reduction is due to the fact that the Yeomanry have not reached their full strength. If they were given another year, at the present rate of increase of 1,000 per quarter, I feel confident that they would reach that number. Is it, then, for financial reasons that the order has been issued? If the order is carried out the force will be reduced by 6,000 or 7,000 men, which would mean a saving of about £100,000. For that sum are you going to insult a force which has undoubtedly done very good work in the South African War? I do not think that His Majesty's Government can have fully realised the hardships that will be inflicted on the Yeomanry by this reduction, especially on the newly-formed regiments and those which made a great effort to get up to the strength laid down last year—590. Under the new regulation the first 120 men who come up to be dismissed in each regiment will be the first 120 attested, probably carefully picked men, a considerable proportion of whom have served in the war. Besides, the question of *personnel*, all the economic details, arrangement of troops, stores, ranges, drill centres, etc., which the regiments have worked at with an expenditure of great labour and expense, will be thrown out of gear, and will have to be started afresh. A further reason for the existing Imperial Yeomanry establishment: it must be remembered that in time of war the wasting of Yeomanry regiments is greater than that of Regulars, from a variety of causes, and there are no Reserves from which to make up the Yeomanry strength. I hope, therefore, the strength of the Yeomanry will not be reduced for any temporary cry of financial reform.

If, however, it is essential, for grave reasons, to reduce the Yeomanry, I would suggest that it should be done in the following manner. Let those regiments, some thirty in number, which are well over the 476 strength, or which have brought up their strength to 590, remain at a strength of 590, while those regiments which are now under 476 strength, of which there are twenty or twenty-five, could be reduced to a lower level. This step would probably reduce the total force by 3,000 men. It might be worked with another idea which is very nearly parallel. There are a certain number of regiments which have always clamoured to be worked on cavalry lines, and a certain number which have started off from the first with the mounted infantry idea. The difference between cavalry and mounted infantry is one rather of method than means. The difference is really one of rapidity of manœuvre, size of horses, and excellence of riding on the part of the men. Both depend on the rifle as their final weapon. In England there are two classes of Yeomanry regiments—those from the hunting counties and those from the towns or non hunting areas. Your county regiments as a rule are small. They are recruited from the real Yeoman class. The men ride horses which are hunted and they are horsemen. On the other hand your town and new Yeomanry, who have gone in for the mounted infantry idea, consist of men who have learnt riding in the riding school. The majority of them have never hunted or ridden over fences. Why not recognise that these two classes exist? Some of the smaller regiments which come from the counties would be of valuable assistance to your cavalry regiments, while the men who live in the towns, who are only riders, and not horsemen, could stick to the mounted infantry idea. I throw this out as a suggestion. I sincerely trust that the noble Earl the Under-Secretary will consider the other point I raised—my suggestion for two establishments of Yeomanry.

Lord HARRIS: My Lords, I sympathise with nearly everything that has been said by my noble and gallant friend opposite, and I should like to add a word or two to show how hardly the order which has been issued affects some regiments, especially in this year. I must confess that I have no grievance myself, because my regiment has not reached the new maximum; but changes are coming rather suddenly and unexpectedly now-a-days in matters military, and I do not know that my regiment may not be affected before another twelve months are out. Therefore, I should be glad of this opportunity of showing how, from a financial point of view, an order of this kind affects a Yeomanry regiment.

The grant which the Government makes for the contingent fund is not sufficient, or anything like sufficient, to clothe the men. It is perfectly true that the order of 1901 specifies certain articles which the War Office considers essential, but it only includes one suit of clothes, and I can hardly suppose that the military authorities want the 30,000 Yeomen to go out for sixteen days training, subject to dust and heat and rain, and have only one suit of clothes. Of course, what really happens is that every man has two suits of clothes. The second suit has to be provided somehow or other out of this grant towards the contingent fund, and the calculation of the War Office is that a Yeomanry regiment ought to be able to cover the cost of clothing the men in three years. As a matter of fact, there are a number of other things besides the men's clothing that have to be found out of this £3, such as headquarters' expenses, postage, and other little items, which run away in the aggregate with a great deal of money, and the result is that it is absolutely impossible to keep within the allowances made for those items upon which the contingent grant may be expended. It is absolutely impossible to keep within these grants whilst a regiment is rapidly increasing—that is to say, whilst you have a number of recruits coming in who have to be clothed and turned out at a cost per head of from £5 to £8, the difference depending rather upon whether a regiment has an extravagant second uniform or not. But even if it were possible to cover the cost in the three years, the order that has now been issued has been issued in the third year from 1901, when the great changes that were made in the Yeomanry came into effect. And let me say as regards those changes that, speaking for myself, and, I should hope, for a great many other Yeomanry colonels, we cannot be too grateful to Mr. Brodrick for all that he did for the Yeomanry in that year. He vitalised the force, and the particular grant he made of £5 for the horse brought by the Yeoman—whether he brings his own horse or hires a horse matters little—has made the whole difference of vitalising the Yeomanry; and I am glad to have this my second opportunity of expressing my personal gratitude to Mr. Brodrick for all that he did in that year. Now, three years after, comes this change, and my impression is that in those regiments which have risen rapidly since 1901, and I include my own regiment in that, there is now, in consequence of that rapid increase, a very heavy debt. It is just as well that it should be publicly understood that a great many Yeomanry regiments are very heavily in debt, and a certain proportion of them in debt through no fault of their own. They are in debt because they have rapidly increased, and because the clothing grant is not sufficient to cover the cost in three years.

This order comes just at the time when there was a chance of those regiments recovering something to pay off this debt. In this way—if you can get a certain number of men to re-engage or to go on serving, their clothing in most cases is good enough to last for another year or two, and perhaps three, and during these extra years when you have not got to re-clothe them you are making something over the £3 a year, and I anticipate from my own calculations, my regiment having reached its maximum —476—that I shall now be able to recover something to pay off the debt which I incurred through no fault of my own. That is all right for me, but how about the regiments that have increased up to the old maximum? They have got to strike a large number of men off their establishment; they will not get the £3 for those men, and therefore they lose this chance of paying off a portion of their debt.

There is a very great hardship in the case of the officers who have to guarantee these debts. I had a long correspondence last year with the military authorities on this subject, and with great civility, but with great regret, they found themselves unable to help me. What was the consequence? The only way of getting out of the difficulty was to go to the bank, but the bank required a guarantee from the officers, and I had to get a certain number of senior officers to assist in a joint and several guarantee that the bank should be refunded if at any time the War Office chose to disband us. I do suggest that it is a very great hardship that at the third year, just when there was a chance of these regiments recovering something, they should lose this opportunity. I sincerely trust that if any more changes as regards numbers are in contemplation somewhat longer notice may be given, so as to enable one to cut one's coat according to one's cloth and regulate one's arrangements accordingly. I express my thanks to my noble and gallant friend opposite for coming forward and speaking so forcibly, and so much to the point, upon this subject, and I am especially glad that he has not been deterred from addressing the House upon a subject of which he has such a thorough knowledge.

LORD GRENFELL: My Lords, I do not rise for the purpose of following the noble Lord with any criticisms on the action of His Majesty's Government in the reduction of the Yeomanry. I have had the great advantage of having held in the past the position of Inspector-General of Auxiliary Forces, and I have lately vacated an Army Corps in which I had a good many Yeomanry regiments. In the past I have had the opportunity of seeing, I think, nearly half the Yeomanry regiments in England, and in those days the inspection of Yeomanry regiments was very pleasant. You arrived on the ground and inspected the regiment; there was a march past, and sometimes it ended in a charge; and, in certain cases, after a charge of Yeomanry I have seen the ground resembling a battle-field. One member of my staff inspecting one of the northern regiments had the good fortune to pick up a gold watch on the field left by a trooper. We all know the difficulties there have been in the Yeomanry in the past, and I only rise to call attention to the extraordinary change that has come over that force. I had the pleasure of inspecting during last year eight Yeomanry regiments in my command, and I cannot say how much I was struck with the efficiency of those regiments and with the manner in which all the various duties, from those of the commanding officer downwards, were carried out. They were regiments which I think any cavalry officer would be proud to command. I do not say they were all raised to the same pitch of efficiency, but the change in the Yeomanry is so very remarkable that I thought I might venture, in the first remarks that I have made in this House, to express the hope, if I might, that the greatest consideration will be given to this force, which has been so lately raised to such a very high state of efficiency.

THE EARL OF ERROLL: My Lords, although I have never served in the Yeomanry myself, I have during the last year or two become intimately connected with them, both at home and elsewhere. It has been my lot to inspect a great many Yeomanry regiments in this country —I think I have inspected something like twenty-six or twenty-eight regiments altogether—and I have had opportunities also of seeing how they work in the field, and I can thoroughly corroborate everything that has fallen from the noble and gallant Lord who has just sat down. Indeed, I have formed a very high opinion of their capabilities and efficiency. I listened with great attention, and no little sympathy, to the noble and gallant Lord who brought this question before your Lordships, and I do hope that the noble Earl the Under-Secretary of State for War, who will answer on behalf of His Majesty's Government, will be able to give him some of the assurances he asked for and calm some of the fears which he expressed. The noble and gallant Lord speaks with all the weight and authority which practical experience in the field and a thorough knowledge of his subject can give, and I do hope that some of his suggestions, even if they are not carried out as a whole, will received the earnest consideration of the Government.

The services of Lovat's Scouts are fresh in your Lordships' memory and I will not allude to them further than to say that those men who served in South Africa formed the nucleus of the very fine body which the noble Lord has raised as his regiment, and I do think that it would be cruel if these men who served their country in war time should, through the new regulations, be the first men to be drafted out of the Yeomanry. The noble and gallant Lord has, I believe, tapped an entirely new district. He has brought together a body of men who, unless we had recourse to conscription, would never be trained in any way to serve the King or to defend their country. Another regiment has been raised in Scotland on somewhat similar lines by another noble Lord. I venture to think the raising of both these corps has been due entirely to the prestige and the great name which these regiments acquired in South Africa, and I think it would be a very great pity to do anything to damp their ardour or to interfere in any way with their efficiency. The men in these regiments are of magnificent physique, they are not the narrow-chested youths that we are accustomed to look upon as the recruits of some of the Line regiments. They are officered by Highland gentlemen who very nearly all have had service in the Army, and a great many of whom have served during the war and are perfectly capable of training their men in practical soldiering. In the ranks, too, there are many men who served in the war. These men teach the young idea not only how to shoot, but how to ride and how to scout.

The Yeoman of to-day is a very different man from the Yeoman of some years ago. Even his dress is more practical and more business-like; his training lasts over double the time that it used to, and it is carried out on sound and practical lines. At the present moment no time is wasted in unnecessary marching, but the instruction given is in scouting, in reconnaissance, and in all the practical duties which go to make up a soldier's work in the field. The greatest pains are taken with their shooting. I cannot but think that a man who is trained like this is a very valuable asset to his country. It will be conceded that the more men we have in the country who can ride and shoot the better, and I think the best way of getting these men trained is to send them to the Yeomanry. If your Lordships had seen, as I did, the second lot of Yeomanry who came out to South Africa in the spring of 1901, who could neither ride nor shoot, I am sure you would realise the importance of being prepared for all eventualities. No doubt these men became efficient later on and did very good service in the field, but they were absolutely untrained when they arrived, and could neither ride nor shoot. I think it was a very dangerous experiment and I hope it will never be repeated. You have in the Yeomanry a very fine force, they are capable of expansion, they are of good physique, they are animated by a spirit of patriotism; and I think it would be a pity not to encourage them. As long as we have a voluntary Army it is very unwise to snub the Auxiliary Forces. It would be both foolish and shortsighted not to make use of this very fine raw material that we have to our hands, and I hope His Majesty's Government will not do anything to discourage their training or reduce their numbers.

LORD WENLOCK: My Lords, as one who has taken a small share in meeting the demands of the Government in increasing the Yeomanry Forces of this country, I should like to associate myself with most of the remarks that fell from my noble friend Lord Lovat, and I should be very glad if the noble Earl the Under-Secretary of State for War would explain exactly what are the reasons for giving us this sort of rebuff at a moment when we were expecting that we should receive every assistance and encouragement. I should like the noble Earl also to tell us whether it is the intention of the Government not to allow any more new regiments to be formed and whether we are to understand that the maximum now laid down is to be the maximum number of Yeomen in the country in the future. That is an important point to be considered. In my own county, where we were called upon to raise a third regiment, I believe it is possible to raise a fourth. I found not the slightest difficulty whatever in getting a very large number of eligible men. I may say that I took every able-bodied young man I could, whether he was able to ride and shoot or not. I have only been out one year, but my own regiment was second in the list of Yeomanry regiments in the district for their shooting, and this shows what with careful training can be done in teaching men the use of the rifle.

I also think it is most important that men should know how to feed and take care of horses. I believe a great deal of our troubles in South Africa arose through men not being acquainted with the system of looking after horses. I can tell your Lordships a case in point, which bears rather on this subject. One of my own men, not at all accustomed to horses, was put on one night as stable guard, and he was heard to tell a friend in the morning that he had never had such a terrible night, for no sooner had he managed to get one horse up than there was another one lying down. I need hardly tell your Lordships that that squad was very quiet on parade next morning. The more men that are trained in the Yeomanry the better it will be. The noble and gallant Lord who spoke a moment or two ago (Lord Grenfell) referred to the Yeomanry as it was in the old days. I am glad to be able also to bear witness to the extraordinary change that has taken place in that force; but if we are to be kept down and our numbers reduced we cannot help looking upon that as an act of great discouragement on the part of His Majesty's Government. I hope the noble Earl will be able to show that the Government have good reasons for such a drastic treatment of this force.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (The Earl of DONOUGHMORE): My Lords, I can assure your Lordships that there is no one more sincere than I am in expressing gratitude to noble Lords who command regiments of Yeomanry for the excellent work they have done in connection with that force during the last few years, and it is, I am sure, doing no wrong to any Yeomanry colonel when I particularise the noble and gallant Lord who introduced this subject, and say that we are deeply grateful to him for all that he has done. Therefore, it was with very great regret that I heard from the noble and gallant Lord the use of the word "insult" in connection with the attitude of the War Office towards the Yeomanry at the present moment. The noble Lord who has just sat down used the word "rebuff." I hope I shall be able to prove to your Lordships, not only that our intentions have never been to offer the slightest insult to that force or to make any rebuff, but that our actions have been in the other direction. I think the speeches which have been delivered by my noble friends Lord Grenfell and Lord Erroll are sufficient proof of the fact that it is not owing to any shortcomings in the Yeomanry force that this reduction is made. Lord Grenfell has spoken of personal knowledge of eight regiments, and Lord Erroll has had considerable experience, and I am glad to say that the general report we have received this year on the Imperial Yeomanry absolutely supports the statements made by these noble Lords.

It is quite true, as the noble and gallant Lord who initiated this discussion has said, that by making this reduction we do reduce the Estimates by a considerable sum, but it was not in order to effect that saving that this reduction in the force has been made. The real reason is, I think, perfectly plain, and I should have thought it would have been in the mind of every student of the Yeomanry question. Your Lordships have already been reminded by Lord Lovat of the history of this movement. Before the war the strength of the Yeomanry was some 10,000 or 12,000. I do not think many regiments were over 400 in strength, and many of them were about 200. Then came the war, and what I will call the Yeomanry movement took place. When the Estimates for 1901–2 came to be considered the establishment of the Yeomanry was fixed at 35,000, but the noble and gallant Lord did not tell us that in that 35,000—and this fact was made perfectly clear by Mr. Brodrick in the House of Commons—was included a special service section; that is to say, a section which on the outbreak of war was to be immediately drafted into the cavalry. The members of this special service section were to receive a retaining fee of £5 a year, and, though the number of 5,000 was taken that year, we never bound ourselves to stick to that number. The rough figure was that it should be about a fourth of the real Yeomanry. A Bill to give effect to this policy was introduced in another place, and it met with such strong opposition that it was withdrawn.

Lord LOVAT: Was it ever really seriously contemplated by His Majesty's Government that there should be a special service squadron?

The Earl of DONOUGHMORE: I think the Government are entitled to claim that they are serious when they introduce a Bill to accomplish a certain object. That Bill was withdrawn in view of the opposition it met with from Yeomanry officers. I quite realise the reasons for that opposition, and I personally cannot help confessing that I rather held the same opinion myself. However, that Bill was withdrawn. Then we came last autumn to frame the Estimates for this year, and we were face to face with the fact that Parliament had decided that this special service section should not exist. We, therefore, decided at the War Office to make the establishment of the Yeomanry the strength that it approximately was then. We had to consider how the reduction was to be made. It might have been possible for us, I admit, to reduce one or two regiments, absolutely to wipe them out, and to leave the establishment at 590, the number which my noble friend prefers. But I think that would have been a very unpopular move, and it would have been very difficult to make up our minds as to which particular regiments were to be reduced. We had to follow the only other alternative, which was to reduce each regiment by a certain number. That was a perfectly fair alternative, and there was no harm done by making that reduction, for if the regiments had had to keep up men of the special service section those men would leave the regiments the minute war was declared. That is the real reason for the reduction which appears in the Estimates. I certainly would claim, and I think my noble friend will admit it on reflection, that commanding officers are very much better off now in this particular, that if war is declared they go to the front with their regiments complete, just as they have been training them in peace. The best men are not drafted to a Regular battalion.

I now come to a point raised by Lord Harris. I know what a debt of gratitude we owe to the noble Lord for his action during the war. It was due to the noble Lord that the great spur was given which brought on the Yeomanry movement. A small number of his Yeomanry were sent out to Natal, and they did so well that the War Office very gladly did all they could to help on the movement and extend it. In answering the noble Lord I shall be replying also to Lord Lovat, "Who," asks Lord Lovat, "are the men who will have to be got rid of? The very best men, because they were the men who came forward first." We ask commanding officers to make this reduction, but we ask them to make it at the other end. It would not be fair that a good man who is very useful in the regiment should not be allowed to re-engage if he wants to at the end of his first term. This reduction is to be made, and we trust commanding officers will help us to make it, but, as I say, it should be made at the other end. It should be effected by stopping recruits, by refusing to let bad characters re-engage. At the same time we offer no objection whatever to commanding officers re-engaging men they consider of good character who will be useful to the regiment. A circular letter to that effect has already gone out to commanding officers.

LORD LOVAT: What was the date of that circular?

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: It was sent out a very few days ago.

LORD LOVAT: I merely asked the question as I am absolutely ignorant of it.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: The noble Lord afterwards unfolded a new plan with reference to the organisation of the Yeomanry. I would naturally regard with very great interest any plan with regard to the Yeomanry brought forward by the noble Lord, but I am sure he would not ask me at once to accept it without consideration. At the same time, I should be very unwilling to decline anything of his off-hand. I can promise him we will consider what he has said this afternoon. I would seriously ask your Lordships to believe that we in the War Office are not unmindful of the good work which has been done by officers of the Imperial Yeomanry during the last few years. I hope that my right hon. friend the Secretary of State has made that clear on more than one occasion; he made it clear in a speech he delivered at Liverpool, and in other speeches delivred since in London. We are actuated by a keen sense of the gratitude the country owes to the Imperial Yeomanry for their services in the late war, and our one effort and one wish is to help in making the force as efficient as possible.

VISCOUNT GALWAY: My Lords, as one who has taken a great interest in the Yeomanry, I should like to make a few remarks upon the speech of the noble Earl the Under-Secretary, and also to join with Lord Harris in thanking the Government for the great assistance they have given in the past to the Yeomanry—I refer especially to the assistance given by the noble Marquess and by Mr. Brodrick. My recollection is rather different from the noble Earl's with regard to the special service squadron. There was a proposal with regard to a special service squadron before a Committee, and the various points as to how it should be raised were discussed. A recommendation was sent from that Committee to the Secretary of State for War, but no distinct proposal on that matter was ever made to the Yeomanry colonels, and I imagine if there had been such a thing it would have been made to the Yeomanry colonels first. A question was raised in the House of Commons with regard to the formation of special service companies of Volunteers, and the proposal was negatived. I presume that it was in consequence of that that any idea of a special service squadron of Yeomanry was dropped. It is a curious argument that the reduction now is in consequence of the falling through of the proposal for the formation of a special service squadron. It seems to me that this is rather an object-lesson to those of us who are connected with the Yeomanry, and, I hope, an object-lesson to the War Office not to attempt to bring about these changes too rapidly. If the War Office wish to have the Auxiliary Forces efficient they must trust the commanding officers to raise the men, and if the commanding officers cannot trust the War Office to know their own minds for more than a few months, they cannot have much confidence in raising the men. The regiment with which I have been so long connected is not affected by this reduction, but, nevertheless, I would seriously put it to the War Office that they cannot possibly attempt to govern the Auxiliary Forces on hard and fast lines from the War Office. Recruiting undoubtedly depends on the personal influence of the officers and non-commissioned officers, and unless those officers have the same encouragement given as ought to be given to the men, I do not see how you can expect that the Auxiliary Forces will flourish. I trust that the kindness which has been shown to the Yeomanry in the past will be extended in the future, and that we shall not have these sudden changes sprung upon us. I hope sufficient time will be given, by the contingent allowance being continued for some years, for regiments to get out of debt, and that we shall do away with the personal responsibility of officers, which is, I think, so much to be deprecated.

Lord MONKSWELL: My Lords, I have only one observation to make on the speech of the noble Earl the Under-Secretary. It is that next to the objection that can reasonably be raised to any sudden and startling change in the action of the War Office is the objection that can be raised to giving a very bad reason for the change. I am not an expert in this matter. I believe there is a difference of opinion even among military officers as to whether 476 or 590 is the proper strength of a Yeomanry regiment, and if noble Lords opposite think that, without any detriment to the efficiency of the Army, they can, either by an increase in the Regular cavalry, or in any other way, make up the number of mounted men required, I am far from saying it may not be desirable to effect an economy where it can be done; but what I cannot understand is the reason given by the noble Earl for this reduction. He says that because the institution of a special service section was negatived by the House of Commons, therefore these regiments are to be cut down by a squadron. He says that is the only reason for this change. I can find no adumbration at all in the speech of Mr. Brodrick in 1901, when he fixed the Yeomanry at 35,000 men, of any suggestion of this kind, and, even if that suggestion was in his mind in that year, three years have since elapsed. Surely it would have been much wiser and much kinder to the Yeomanry not to have allowed them to go on for three years thinking that 35,000 was the establishment, only to find at a very awkward time for them that they are suddenly cut down by 7,000. Surely three years is much too long a time for the authorities at the War Office to take to make up their minds on this question. They have made drastic alterations in the Auxiliary Forces at headquarters without waiting for the Report of the Duke of Norfolk's Commission, and yet we are told by the Under-Secretary of State that it took them three years to make up their minds.

The Earl of DONOUGHMORE: I said nothing of the kind.

Lord MONKSWELL: But that is what it comes to. During the whole of the three years we had no inkling whatever that the establishment was to be reduced. It does occur to me that in some respects the administration of the War Office is singularly leisurely, and in other respects exceedingly hasty, and while there may or may not be good reasons for this I say that if it was to be made at all and especially if it was to be made for the reason that the noble Earl has given, it certainly ought to have been made before this.

Lord DENMAN: My Lords, I only rise to say a word or two by way of endorsing what has fallen from the noble Lord who has just sat down. I cannot follow the noble Earl the Under-Secretary that the withdrawal of the proposal for the special service squadron has led to this reduction. As far as I remember the Bill for the special service squadron was introduced by Mr. Brodrick in the autumn of the session of 1902. It was then dropped because there was so much opposition to it. Surely that was the time when the military authorities should have made up their minds. It is rather a long time, from the autumn of 1902 to the present moment, to take to make up their minds whether they are to have a special service squadron or not. I am very glad to hear from such experts as Lord Grenfell and Lord Erroll statements as to the efficiency of the Yeomanry at the present moment. As a Yeomanry officer myself I am naturally glad to hear such opinions from such men and I can hardly think that this cutting down of the Yeomanry in the way proposed can be regarded by the force as other than a severe rebuff. The noble Earl the Under-Secretary stated that the War Office owe a great debt of gratitude to Yeomanry officers. It seems to me that the War Office have a very peculiar method of expressing their gratitude. Surely it is not such a very expensive force that they are obliged for the sake of saving £100,000 to reduce——

The Earl of DONOUGHMORE: I expressly denied that that was our motive.

Lord DENMAN: Then I cannot see why the War Office should have waited two years before making up their mind. On the question of expenditure, I would only say that Yeomanry officers have to spend a great deal out of their own pockets. For every £1 spent by the Government another £1 is spent by Yeomanry officers, and therefore I should have thought it would be as well, on the ground of economy, to retain the force at its maximum strength.

Earl CARRINGTON: My Lords, I think we can congratulate His Majesty's Government on beginning to exercise some economy in public expenditure, though we would not be prepared to say that they are going the right way to work by cutting down the money voted for that gallant service, the Imperial Yeomanry, to whose value so much recognition has been made this afternoon. There was one statement which fell from my noble and gallant friend Lord Lovat which I think the country would be very glad to have affirmed by the Under-Secretary. The noble and gallant Lord said that the Yeomanry now possess 30,000 horses.

The Earl of ERROLL: The number is 25,000.

Earl CARRINGTON: Well, we should be very glad to have that absolutely confirmed. I happen to know something about the Bucks Hussars, which has an establishment of 590. Nearly the whole of those men ride hired horses. A yeoman is given, I understand, £5 to hire his horse, or the Government hire it for him. These horses come into camp in a very low condition, and after they have had fourteen days of Government rations they pick up, and at the end of the training look very well indeed. What I should like to know is whether those horse are ridden by different men and counted over and over again like the oxen in South Africa, which were sold to the Government several times over, and finally disposed of at Bond Street prices to feed the troops. It would be satisfactory if we could get an assurance from the Under-Secretary that in the event of the Government hiring horses, once hired is hired for the year, and that a horse ridden four or five times is not counted as four or five horses.

The Marquess of LANSDOWNE: My Lords, I only desire to enforce one point before this extremely interesting and instructive discussion comes to an end. I cannot help thinking that some noble Lords who have spoken this evening have not quite sufficiently realised that the reduction which is proposed in the Yeomanry is in the main a reduction not of strength, but of establishment. The two things are very different. The establishment of the Yeomanry for some time past has stood at between 34,000 and 35,000 men. That was the highest establishment to which it sprang during the time of the war, the old establishment, as I daresay my noble friend remembers, having been only about 12,000.

That high establishment has never been reached; it has never risen higher than something over 28,000 men, and the intention of the War Office, as I understand, is to make the revised establishment correspond more closely with the actual strength at the present time. It follows, therefore, that the men who will have to be eventually got rid of are not the number by which the establishment and the strength differ, but the number by which the existing strength and the new establishment differ.

How is this reduction to be effected? It has been said by several noble Lords who have addressed us that it is extremely hard upon these Yeomanry regiments that they should be called upon to get rid of trained men, the backbone of the corps, whom it might be impossible to replace. That is a very convincing argument, but it is one which has been met by the War Office. I understand that orders have been issued under which the commanding officers of Yeomanry regiments will be allowed to bring down their strength to the normal establishment gradually, and by stopping recruiting, rather than by getting rid of men who have served for some time, and whom they naturally desire to retain in the force. That seems to me to be an eminently reasonable way of setting to work. Changes of this kind are inevitable, and it is the duty of the Government to bring them into operation in the most considerate manner possible, and I venture to think that the War Office has in this case shown great consideration for the requirements of the Yeomanry. With reference to the abandonment of the proposal for maintaining a certain number of men in the Yeomanry as members of a special service section, some doubt was thrown upon the history of the case as given by my noble friend behind me, but I really do not think there is any doubt about it. I hold in my hand an extract from a speech delivered by the Secretary of State for War the year before last in moving the Army Estimates, and in that speech he announced that it was proposed to offer to men in the Yeomanry, up to a certain number—5,000 in all—£5 a year to place themselves on the list of the Yeomanry Reserve for the purpose of serving abroad in the event of mobilisation.

Not only was that statement made by the Secretary of State, but a Bill was introduced into the House of Commons, but in consequence of the opposition which it encountered the Government decided not to persevere with it during the session of that year. I am told that they by no means abandoned it at once, and that the Secretary of State was not without hope of being able to produce a more acceptable measure for the same purpose in another session. That particular scheme has now been abandoned, and it seems to me quite natural that in consequence of its abandonment it should be thought desirable to reduce the establishment of the Yeomanry by a number of men about corresponding to the number of the special service section. Such a reduction was all the more reasonable, because, as I have just pointed out to your Lordships, the actual strength of the Yeomanry never has come within 5,000 or 6,000 men of the authorised establishment. I hope, therefore, noble Lords connected with the Yeomanry will be of opinion that they really have not in this matter any cause of complaint of the War Office, which, on the contrary, as I have every reason to know, most earnestly desires to recognise the very valuable services rendered by the Yeomanry in the past, and to do what they can to render the force more efficient in the future.

THE IRISH LAND ACT.

*THE EARL OF WESTMEATH: My Lords, I rise to ask if the attention of His Majesty's Government has been directed to the language reported to have been used at a meeting of the East Galway Executive of the United Irish League at Ballinasloe, on Sunday, 15th May; and if they propose to take any steps in the matter. It is to me a matter of very real regret that I find myself bound at this time, when the new Land Act has been little more than half a year in force, to bring a matter of this nature before your Lordships. I do not think, however, that I need offer any apology for doing so, for I find that the people in this country are left very imperfectly informed of what is really happening in Ireland, and this constitutes for us a danger which I think we owe it to ourselves to remove.

So little is the state of affairs over there understood, that I may mention as an example that yesterday when I attended a meeting at the Mansion House to support the establishment of an international exhibition in Ireland, one of the speakers referred to the land question as completely settled, and no longer capable of delaying the onward march of progress and prosperity. One wishes indeed that it were so, but unfortunately we have to look at the other side of the shield, and we are confronted with a state of affairs which gives very little justification for such optimism. Very many revolutionary and violent speeches have, unfortunately, been delivered in Ireland during the last few months, but I think that the proceedings which took place at the meeting of the East Galway Executive of the United Irish League on Sunday last were of an exceptionally mischievous character, and fully justified me in bringing the matter before your Lordships' House.

The meeting was addressed by, amongst others, two members of Parliament and the Roman Catholic clergyman, and each speaker seemed determined to, if I may say so, go one better than his predecessor in the force and energy of his language. The chairman (Mr. T. J. Manning) opened the proceedings with some observations which, in comparison with what follows, may be described as mild and almost platitudinous, he merely remarking among other things that—

> "They had at last brought the fortress of landlordism, with all its accursed associations, to the point of capitulation, and they should maintain their organisation in full strength till their objects were achieved; and in the national organisation, without preaching either confiscation or anything immoral, the tenantry of Ireland had that behind their backs which would strength their hands and protect them if they made a proper use of it."

I do not know what the speaker was referring to when he said that "the tenantry of Ireland had behind their backs that which would strengthen their hands." That remark was received with laughter, so we may, I suppose, draw our own conclusions. The next speaker was the parish priest of Ballinasloe, the Rev. J. Pelly, who remarked that every man should join the League, and added—

> "If any man stood out let them make it hot for him."

Father Pelly was succeeded by Mr. Roche, M.P., who said—

> "He was convinced that the time was not far distant when they would have to fall back on the organisation which had won such victories for them in the past. There should be a branch in every parish, and every man should be a member."

he further said—

> "In future no man ought to be elected to the position of district councillor in any part of East Galway unless he was a member of the the national organisation. On no account should they allow any sale to take place between a body of tenants and the landlords directly.

He quoted a case in which he said that a landlord had put holdings up for competition between his tenants, and let them go to the highest bidder. The result was that the men who stopped at home during the agitation and minded their own business, and had got a few pounds more than their neighbours who had been attending meetings, got the farms, and the men who supported the national agitation were left out in the cold. He begged of them "to set their faces against the grazing system by every possible means." I would specially draw your Lordships' attention to the remark of the speaker in which he admits that the industrious farmer who minds his own business is able not only to make both ends meet, but to save a little money to increase his holdings. But he does not get any credit for his industry. On the contrary he is held up as a warning and a reproach, and contrasted very unfavourably with the idle loafer who spends his time going to meetings and neglecting his work, and minding everybody's affairs but his own. I would also ask your Lordships to observe that Mr. Roche's dictum that no sales are to be allowed to take place between a body of tenants and the landlord directly is exactly contrary to the intentions of the framers of the Bill of 1903, which was based on voluntary agreements between landlords and tenants. Such advice, or I may say such orders, entirely destroy any chance which may remain of landlords in the West obtaining anything like a fair price for their lands.

Another speaker, Mr. John O'Donnell, M.P., said, *inter alia*—

"East Galway had already the distinction of engaging the attention of the House of Lords. That was a proof that they were doing work for Ireland, and work annoying to the landlords who had been crushing them. He could not say at present, nor would it be prudent for him to say, what the Directory might decide upon in the future. The time might, or might not, be ripe for taking such action as was hinted at by the House of Lords, but whenever action was taken they must be in a position to see that they would be victorious in any struggle in which they would be engaged."

Again Mr. O'Donnell said—

"If their organisation was perfect, and if they were true to each other, when they had their arrangements made in such a way that the enemy would not be aware of their plans until the moment arrived to strike, they would rise up in their might and say to the graziers, the grabbers, and the landlords, "Faugh-a-Ballagh." The time had come to declare war upon the accursed enemies of our race. The time had come when we should go into the possession of the land of our fathers. Members of Parliament, priests, and people should stand together now—the most important crisis in Irish affairs for the past 150 years. The time had come when neither Dublin Castle nor Irish landlordism should be allowed to stand between them and their God-given rights. In the old days the men of Connaught smashed the power of landlordism, and struck terror into the hearts of tyrants, and he believed there was material enough in Ireland and Galway to show the common enemy that they would have men to face if they were unreasonable, or not willing to sell at a fair and reasonable price."

That utterance was followed by loud applause. My Lords, I hope I have said enough to convince you that the situation in Ireland, especially at this moment in the West, is a difficult and a dangerous one, and one that may develop into a state of affairs which it may be difficult to remedy if allowed to go on unchecked. In these circumstances I think I am justified in asking His Majesty's Government what steps, if any, they propose to take to prevent speeches such as those I have quoted from being delivered, and what punishment, if any, they propose to inflict upon their authors. The harm they do is incalculable, and can only be realised by those who have any experience of the situation in the West of Ireland to-day.

The issue is a plain one. (1) Are speeches of this nature to be allowed to be delivered with impunity or are they not? (2) Is the voluntary character of the Act of 1903 to be defeated by the orders of professional agitators or is it not? (3) Are turbulent priests to be allowed to "make things hot" for law-abiding British subjects who do not wish to join the League, or are they not? In short, (4) are His Majesty's Government prepared to exercise the ordinary functions of a Government in protecting rights and property in Ireland, or are they not? I appeal to the Chief Secretary not to pass over such incidents as these, but to recognise that a state of affairs exists which calls for serious attention. He has entered enthusiastically into the solution of one of the Irish questions, and his reputation as a statesman cannot fail to be largely affected by the action which he may take in a crisis which demands all his courage and all his firmness. If he shows himself determined to put down disorder and to prevent the incitement to it, he will indeed have deserved well of his country; but if he allows the present state of affairs to continue, and licence to remain unchecked, then indeed may despairing Unionists cry out, "Oh, liberty, what crimes are committed in thy name!" I beg to ask the Question which stands in my name.

*Lord CLONBROCK: My Lords, I desire to associate myself with all that has been said by my noble friend. The Purchase Act of last year is fast becoming a dead letter. The future of that Act must be a matter of conjecture. Whether the transfer which it facilitates of land in Ireland from those who now own it, and who are, as a rule, warmly attached to the connection with this country, to those who are, at least at present, bitterly hostile to that connection, will be eventually conducive to the prosperity of Ireland and the good relations between the two countries must be a matter of conjecture; whether further, it is possible by Act of Parliament, not only to establish, but to permanently secure a system of small proprietors, or whether the more thrifty men will not, in some way or other, absorb the property of their less provident neighbours, with the result that, in some fifty or 100 years there will be as many landlords as ever, and perhaps a good deal harder ones, must also be a matter of conjecture;

but, whatever opinions we may hold on this subject, all must allow that the Act of last year was an honest and well-meaning effort on the part of His Majesty's Government to put a stop to the state of unrest and disquiet long existing in Ireland, brought about by faulty legislation in the past, and all must desire that that Act should have a fair trial. But how is it to have a fair trial, when the tyranny is allowed to exist which my noble friend has described, when men are not allowed to make their own bargains, but must do so only with the authority of the League in the manner prescribed by the League, and on terms settled for them by the League. Moreover, how can the Act be anything but a dead letter when we are told that landlords are to be forced to sell? The voluntary nature of the Act is being entirely lost sight of. Owners of farms are to be starved into submission. The action of the League is such as would lead one to think that the leaders are anxious that the Act should not succeed, and that a state of unrest should continue, under which, as often happens, the leaders of agitation live and thrive, while their unfortunate followers are ruined. Assuming that their professions are sincere and that they are striving to get the best terms for the tenant farmers, it is perfectly clear that in most cases the result will be that landowners will prefer to face the chance of loss, annoyance, and possible danger by refusing the terms proposed to them, rather than be exposed to the certainty of loss by acquiescing in them. A few, no doubt, may be terrorised into submission, and may accept anything that is offered to them, and, so far, transfers will take place. But it is not under such auspices and such conditions that His Majesty's Government can wish their policy to be carried into effect. We therefore call upon the Government to maintain the voluntary nature of the Act of last year, to sternly repress any tendency to intimidation, and to refuse to sanction agreements in districts where such agitation and intimidation are known to exist.

*THE EARL OF DENBIGH: My Lords, I need hardly say that the action unfortunately taken at the present moment in some parts of Ireland is extremely disappointing to those who hoped that they might count upon the co-operation of all parties for the purpose of making that great Act of last year a genuine success, and for the purpose of bringing peace and quiet to that distracted country of Ireland. I can only assure the noble Earl, by emphasising what I stated the other day in reply to Lord Muskerry, that His Majesty's Government will be prepared to take all measures necessary for the purpose of protecting the life and property of individuals, and for the purpose of enforcing the law. With regard to the speeches quoted by the noble Lord it is certainly much to be regretted that language of this character should have been used, for no doubt in addition to its possible result in inciting to criminal courses those who might act on the advice given, it cannot possibly fail to impede the peaceful and rapid working of the Land Purchase Act of last year, especially in the direction of the reinstatement of the evicted tenants. That measure was based upon a general agreement that it was voluntary in its character, and should be allowed by those interested to be carried out on the broad lines of voluntary purchase. If the tenants are not compelled to buy, but on the contrary have all their rights under preceding legislation preserved to them, so on the other side must the landlords not be forced to sell by a system of violence, intimidation, or invasion of their legal rights. Lord Westmeath quoted a speech made by a Roman Catholic priest at the meeting to which he referred. I should like as a set-off to that to draw his attention to the words which fell from the Archbishop of Cashel and Emly, which I think your Lordships will agree shows the correct spirit in which the settlement of this great question should be approached. His Lordship is reported to have said at Drum, county Tipperary—

"When working for the distribution of the land we must do nothing in violation of the laws of charity. Keep strictly within the bounds of honour in all your dealings. As far as I can judge, and I have an experience of over thirty-four years as priest and Bishop, the spirit of revenge is the best indication of a mean, low individual, while the spirit of forgiveness is the best indication of a noble nature. Be full of the noble spirit of forgiveness, and be not actuated by the spirit of revenge, in spiritual as well as in social conduct."

I only hope that the words which fell from his Lordship the Archbishop may be taken to heart in the proper quarter, and that many others may be found besides the Bishop who may seek to do their part to give the interpretation to the Land Act which was desired by His Majesty's Government, and who have the welfare of Ireland at heart.

*THE EARL OF WESTMEATH: My Lords, I asked the Government what steps would be taken to put down the kind of thing of which I complained, but I have only received a vague reply. The noble Lord who has spoken for the Government has not said whether he intends to take any action in the matter, and what I wish to——

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: I must remind the noble Lord that he has no right of reply.

*THE EARL OF WESTMEATH thereupon resumed his seat, and the subject dropped.

House adjourned at twenty-five minutes past Five o'clock to Tuesday, 7th of June next, a quarter past Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 19th May, 1904.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS (NO STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, referred on the First Reading thereof, no Standing Orders are applicable, viz.:—Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 14) Bill.

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time upon Tuesday, 31st May.

Blyth and Cowpen Gas Bill; Whitby Gas Bill. Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Harlow and Sawbridgeworth Gas Bill [Lords]; Nuneaton and Chilvers Coton Urban District Council Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Ordered, That Standing Orders 39, 128, and 230 be suspended, and that the time for depositing Petitions and Memorials against Private Bills, or against any Bill to confirm any Provisional Order or Provisional Certificate, and for depositing duplicates of any Documents relating to any Bill to confirm any Provisional Order or Provisional Certificate, also for depositing at the Private Bill Office all Documents relating to any Order under The Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, be extended to the first day on which the House shall sit after the Recess.—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means.*)

Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Provisional Order. Bill to confirm a Provisional Order, under The Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Act, 1863, and the Acts amending the same, relating to the Farney Bridge and Ballynahow Drainage District, in the county of Tipperary, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Victor Cavendish and Mr. Wyndham.

Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Provisional Order Bill. "To confirm a Provisional Order, under The Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Act, 1863, and the Acts amending the same, relating to the Farney Bridge and Ballynahow Drainage District, in the county of Tipperary," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills and to be printed. [Bill 213.]

Paisley District Tramways Order Confirmation. Bill to confirm a Provisional Order, under The Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, relating to Paisley District Tramways, ordered to be brought in by The Lord Advocate and Mr. A. Graham Murray.

Paisley District Tramways Order Confirmation Bill. "To confirm a Provisional Order, under The Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, relating to Paisley District Tramways," presented accordingly; and ordered to be considered upon Tuesday, 31st May.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to—Amersham, Beaconsfield, and District Water Bill, without Amendment.

Chippenham Gas Bill, with Amendments.

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confirm a Provisional Order made by the Board of Trade under The General Pier and Harbour Act, 1861, relating to Wexford. [Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 1) Bill [Lords].

Also, a Bill, intituled. "An Act for conferring further powers upon the Great Western Railway Company in respect of their own undertaking, and upon that Company and the London and North Western Railway Company in respect of undertakings in which they are jointly interested, and upon the Great Western and Great Central Railways Joint Committee in respect of their undertaking; for authorising the abandonment of the Somersetshire Coal Canal and the vesting of the site thereof in the Great Western Railway Company; for amalgamating the Abingdon Railway Company with the Great Western Railway Company; and for other purposes." [Great Western Railway Bill [Lords].

And, also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confer further powers on the Urban District Council of Filey, in the East Riding of the county of York, in relation to their gas and water undertakings and in relation to the seashore; and to make further and better provision for the improvement, health, local government, and finance of the district; and for other purposes." [Filey Improvement Bill [Lords].

Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 1) Bill [Lords]. Read the first time; referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 214.]

Great Western Railway Bill [Lords]; Filey Improvement Bill [Lords]. Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions for alteration; from Blair Atholl; Logiewait; and Paisley; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions against; from Cardiff (eleven); Rhydwyn; Wolverton; Manchester and Salford; Llanfechell; Southampton (three); Cowbridge Road; Bodedeon; Duns and Chirnside; Holyhead; Shirley; Kingston-upon-Hull; Barry; New Milns; Findhorn; Cranford; Tonyrefail (two); Cadoxton (two); Hafodyrynys; Bridgend; Brymbo; Brynteg; Greave Fold; Woodley; Noddfa; Gee Cross; Black Isle; Boundary Street East; Halifax; Scone; Pwllheli; Bishopsgate; Canning Town; Lee and Hither Green; Glasgow (five); Greenock (five); Stratford (three); Wrexham; Custom House; Devonport; Pontmorwrid; Upton Manor; Barking Road (two); Plaistow; Silvertown, Coneysthorpe; Stamford; Silver Stream; Penysarn; Brampton; Birmingham (five); Hockley; Faversham; Altrincham; Roath Park; Preston; Reading; Peddieston; North Wales Women's Temperance Union; Cemaes Bay; Crouch End; Old Fletton; Glossop; Nottingham (two); Holloway; Gomersal; Sandhurst; Camberley and York; Mirfield; Darvil; Perth; Chichester; Tenby; Aberdeen; Leith (two); Musselburgh (two); Arthog; Derby (two); Stratford New Town; West Ham; Ardrishaig; Easdale; Great Waltham; Kelso; Tighnabruaich; Dunoon; Nelson; Badsey; Aston Park; Leominster; Clayton West; Johnstown; Frenchay; Richmond Road; Blaenavon; Swansea; Canning Town; Wyke; Ashton in Makerfield; Campbeltown; Cwmbwrla; Rhyddings; Sparkhill; Ayr (two); Blaydon on Tyne; Newtown; Garesfield; Stapleton; Ashby de la Zouch; Smarden; Dollar; Street; Silverton; Cwmbran (Monmouth) (four); New Silksworth; Kinross; North West Gloucester; Liverpool; Manchester (two); Beaminster;

Troedyrhiew (two); Merthyr; Somerset; New Lambton; Forest Gate; Sunderland (two); Margrove Park; New Hirst; Leigh; Cullen; Stevenston; Barrhead; Johnstone; South Forfar; Kirkwall; and Edinburgh; to lie upon the Table.

SUNDAY TRADING (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Aberdeen, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

TUBERCULOSIS (ANIMALS) COMPENSATION BILL.

Petitions against; from Paisley; and Ayr; to lie upon the Table.

VALUATION BILL.

Petition from King's Lynn, against; to lie upon the Table.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES BILL.

Petition from Sunderland, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION BILL.

Petition from Bristol, against; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Rules and Programme of Examinations for 1905 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 180.]

IRISH LAND ACT, 1903.

Copy ordered, "of Returns (1) of estates sold to persons other than the Land Commission; (2) of applications for advances lodged where sales have not yet been completed; (3) of proceedings under various sections of the Irish Land Act, 1903; (4) of applications for advances entirely or partly refused; (5) of sales in the Land Judge's Court to persons other than the Land Commission; (6) of estates of lunatics sold with the sanction of the Lord Chancellor of Ireland; all in respect of the period of six months ended 30th April, 1904."—(*Mr. Wyndham.*)

Copy presented accordingly; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 181.]

LAND JUDGE'S COURT (IRELAND).

Copy ordered, "of a Return, by counties, of the estates in the Land Judge's Court over which receivers have been appointed." — (*Mr. Wyndham.*)

Copy presented accordingly; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 182.]

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Copy presented, of Regulations of the Board of Education, dated 13th May, 1904, providing for Grants on Account of the Education of Defective and Epileptic Children, and prescribing conditions to be fulfilled by certified schools for such children [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

FOREIGN JURISDICTION ACT, 1890.

Copy presented, of Order in Council of 16th May, 1904, entitled The Bechuanaland Protectorate (Lands) Order in Council, 1904 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

EXPERIMEMTS ON LIVING ANIMALS.

Return presented, relative thereto [Address 17th May; *Mr. Cochrane*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 183.]

SUEZ CANAL (COMMERCIAL, No. 4, 1904).

Copy presented, of Returns of Shipping and Tonnage, 1901, 1902, and 1903 (in continuation of "Commercial, No. 4, 1903") [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

BRITISH GUIANA ORDINANCE, 1891.

Address for "Copy of the Correspondence between the India Office and the Colonial Office, with reference to the British Guiana Ordinance, 1891."—(*Sir Henry Fowler.*)

EAST INDIA (FINANCIAL STATEMENT).

Address for "Return of Indian Financial Statement for 1904–5, and of the Proceedings of the Legislative Council of the Governor-General thereon."—(*Sir Henry Fowler.*)

ARRESTS FOR DRUNKENNESS (IRELAND).

Return ordered, "giving the number of Arrests for Drunkenness within the

Metropolitan Police District of Dublin and the cities of Belfast, Cork, Limerick, and Waterford, from the hour of 8 a.m. on Sunday till 2 p.m., from 2 p.m. to 7 p.m., from 7 p.m. to 9 p.m., from 9 p.m. to 12 midnight, from 12 midnight to 8 a.m. on Monday, between the 1st day of May, 1903, and the 30th day of April, 1904, both days inclusive, the Arrests being given from 8 a.m. on Sundays till 8 a.m. on Mondays."

"And, similar Returns for the rest of Ireland from the 1st day of May, 1903, to the 30th day of April, 1904."—(*Mr. Sloan.*)

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 7) BILL.

Copy ordered, "of Memorandum stating the nature of the Proposals contained in the Provisional Orders included in the Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill."—(*Mr. Bonar Law.*)

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 8) BILL.

Copy ordered, "of Memorandum stating the nature of the Proposals contained in the Provisional Orders included in the Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill."—(*Mr. Bonar Law.*)

INDIAN ARMY (MEMORANDUM).

Address for "Return of the Memorandum recently issued by General Lord Kitchener of Khartoum, and the local Commander-in-Chief in India upon the organisation and training of the Army in India, and the necessity for the whole of the European male population to be practised to arms in the Volunteer Force."—(*Sir Howard Vincent.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Inadequate Pier Accommodation at Buncrana.

MR. O'DOHERTY (Donegal, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the fact that quantities of herrings have been discharged at Buncrana Pier during the last few weeks; and that on account of the inadequacy of pier accommodation at Buncrana quantities of the fish have been lost in the discharging thereof, and inconvenience is caused to fishermen and others discharging fish at the pier; and whether, as Buncrana is now a well-established fishing centre, steps will be taken to have the existing pier enlarged or another substituted therefor.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) I am informed that large quantities of herrings have been recently landed at Buncrana and that quantities of the fish have been lost for the reason stated. The question of the extension of the pier is, as I have already stated, under the consideration of the Government, who are in correspondence with the Admiralty on the subject.

Mr. S. W. Adams' Estate, near Millstreet, County Cork.

MR. FLYNN: (Cork County, N.) To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the tenants on the estate of Mr. Samuel Wallis Adams, near Millstreet, county Cork, have declined the landlord's offer to sell at 21½ years purchase of first-term rents and 24½ of second-term, and that one tenant, Jeremiah O'Connor, holding two evicted farms, has expressed his desire to purchase at the landlord's terms; and whether, in view of the fact that town park holdings at Millstreet were sold in March last at 20 years purchase on the valuation of the Purchase Commissioner, the Estates Commissioners have power to advance the amount, representing 24½ years purchase, to this individual tenant.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) No application is before the Estates Commissioners in respect to this estate, nor have they received any application for reinstatement for evicted tenants on the estate.

Strength of Royal Irish Constabulary in County Cork.

MR. FLYNN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can say what was the statutory strength of the Royal Irish Constabulary in the county of Cork during the years 1892 and 1893 respectively; whether the full number to which the county was entitled were stationed in it during those years; and whether the number was increased during the years mentioned.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The strength of the free *quota* of police assigned to the county of Cork (exclusive of the city of Cork) in 1892 and 1893 was 764. The force was maintained at its full strength in each period. There was an extra force numbering 100 men in the East Riding of Cork, in 1892, and an extra force of 56 men in the West Riding of the county in the same year. At the end of 1893 the extra force had been reduced to 89 in the former Riding and to 37 in the latter Riding. In addition there was a small and varying reserve force in the East Riding in both years.

Cotton Corners—Action of United States Government.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he will consider the advisability of giving instructions to the Foreign Office Department to write to the United States Government for the particulars of the various steps the American exchanges have taken in co-operation with the United States Government in order to make future corners in cotton almost impossible; and whether he will cause the information to be laid before the House.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) I am afraid I can add nothing to the Answer which I gave on 11th May.†

Tenders for Battleship Armour.

MR. J. F. HOPE (Sheffield, Brightside): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if he can say approximately when the tenders for the balance of the armour required for the ships of last year's programme will be issued.

(*Answered by Mr. Pretyman.*) Tenders for barbette and conning tower armour for H.M.S. "Achilles," "Cochrane," "Natal," and "Warrior," were issued on the 17th May. It is expected that tenders for the remaining portions of the armour for the ships of last year's programme will be invited in June.

Educational Value of Vivisection.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he has yet received the Report of the Committee appointed by the Royal College of Physicians to ascertain whether, in their judgment, experiments on living animals before classes are necessary for the education of medical students; and, if so, will he state the nature of the opinion expressed.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) I presume the hon. Member refers to the special consideration which the Royal College of Physicians, at my request, gave to the question whether experiments on living animals (under anæsthetics) were necessary for the proper teaching of pharmacology. I have received the opinion of the College on this question, and it is to the effect that science can only be adequately taught with the aid of demonstrations which involve, in the case of physiology and pharmacology, experiments on living animals.

Factory Act, 1901—Section 61.

MR. SHACKLETON (Lancashire, Clitheroe): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the recent decision in which it was held that a woman had not been knowingly employed under Section 61 of the Factory Act, 1901, in spite of the evidence brought by Miss Squires, His Majesty's inspector of factories; and, if so, whether he will take steps, by legislation or otherwise, to render the enforcement of this section more easy.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) I have had before me the case to which the hon. Member apparently refers, but the only remedy, if any, seems to be by legislation. I can hardly hold out any hope of introducing a measure on this point, both in view of the fact that it was so recently before Parliament, and on account of the intrinsic difficulty of making any more stringent provision; but if the hon. Member has any practicable suggestion to offer I will give it the most careful consideration.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxxxiv., 1028.

Motor Cars Act—Traders Licences.

Mr. SCOTT-MONTAGU (Hampshire, New Forest): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the case of a Mr. Macleod, who has been summoned at the West London Police Court for an alleged infringement of Section 2, Sub-section (b), of The Motor Cars Act, 1903; whether, in view of the fact that the special traders licence and number plate has hitherto been held to cover the case of motor-cars used by a trader in the pursuance of his business, he will state what action he proposes to take.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) I am informed that the point at issue in the case to which my hon. friend refers is whether or not the car in question was being used by a trader in pursuance of his business, so as to bring it within the enactment quoted. I can express no opinion with regard to a case pending in a Court of Law.

Second Division Clerks on Temporary Duty.

Mr. CROOKS (Woolwich): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he will state the number of Second Division clerks employed on temporary duty, and the respective offices in which they were serving, who had more than two-and-a-half years Second Division service on the 1st April, 1904; the number of permanently appointed Second Division clerks who had less than two-and-a-half years Second Division service on 1st April, 1904, and the respective offices to which they have been appointed.

(*Answered by Mr. Victor Cavendish.*) Number of Second Division clerks employed on temporary duty who had more than two-and-a-half years Second Division service on 1st April, 1904:—

Department.	No.
Admiralty	93
Agriculture and Fisheries, Board of	3
Charity Commission	1
Colonial Office	3
Board of Education	14
Exchequer and Audit Department	1
Inland Revenue	1
Lunacy Commission	1
Post Office	4
Public Works Office, Ireland	1
Registrar-General's Office, England	3
Secretary for Scotland, Office of	1
Scotch Education Department	3
Trade, Board of	4
War Office	135
	268

Number of permanently appointed Second Division clerks† who had less than two-and-a-half years Second Division service on 1st April, 1904:—

Department.	No.
Admiralty	6
Agriculture and Fisheries, Board of	1
British Museum	2
Department of Agriculture, etc., Ireland	10
Charity Commission	2
Chief Secretary's Office, Ireland	2
Civil Service Commission	1
Constabulary Office, Ireland	2
Deeds, Ireland, Registry of	5
Education, Board of	24
Exchequer and Audit Department	9
Foreign Office	7
Friendly Societies' Registry	2
Home Office	2
Inland Revenue	58
Irish Land Commission	10
King's and Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer, Edinburgh	1
Local Government Board, England	16
Local Government Board, Ireland	6
Local Government Board, Scotland	2
Mint	1
National Debt Office	2
National Education Office, Ireland	7
Pay Office, Supreme Court	1
Paymaster-General's Office	3
Post Office	155
Public Works Loan Board	3
Public Works Office, Ireland	9
Reformatories' Office, England	2
Registrar-General's Office, Ireland	3
Scotch Education Department	4
Stationery Office	6
Trade, Board of	18
Treasury	1
Valuation Office, Ireland	1
War Office	4
Works, Office of	6
Total	394

---

†This list shows the number of appointments according to the Registers of the Civil Service Commissioners. Fifty-nine of these clerks had been promoted to the Second Division from lower ranks in the service.

Reply to Memorials of Assistant Clerks.

MR. ERNEST GRAY (West Ham, N.): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he can state when a reply will be given to the memorials, dated December, 1903, and January, 1904, from the Assistant Clerks (New Class).

(*Answered by Mr. Victor Cavendish.*) The matter is still under consideration, and a reply will be sent as soon as possible.

Dublin Telegraph Office—Public Cross-Examination of Officials.

MR. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that the senior superintendent in the Dublin Telegraph Office is in the habit, when official cases are in progress, of bringing those concerned into the rostrum, in full view of the male and female staffs, and cross-examining them; and whether he will say if this is a recognised practice throughout the service; and, if not, will he put a stop to such treatment of the staff in Dublin.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) My attention has not been drawn to the matter referred to by the hon. Member, but I will make inquiry.

Vacant Postmastership of Ennis.

MR. NANNETTI: To ask the Postmaster-General if he can say how long the postmastership of Ennis is vacant; can he state why this position has not been advertised in the Official Circular; and if it is the intention to appoint an English official to the post.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) The vacancy dates from 27th March, 1904. The salary for an incoming postmaster is under revision, and as soon as it has been fixed the vacancy will be advertised in the Post Office Circular.

Post Office Hours of Collection Plates—Alleged Inaccuracies in the W.C. District.

MR. H. J. WILSON (Yorkshire, W.R., Holmfirth): To ask the Postmaster-General why the plates on pillar boxes showing the hours of collection in the W.C. postal district show a collection at 12 o'clock (midnight), whereas there is no such collection; and why the collection, which really takes place at 1.0 a.m., is not shown upon the plates.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) I am obliged to the hon. Member for pointing out the omission to alter the time on the plates, and I have given directions for the alteration to be made forthwith.

Establishment of a Consular Court in the Congo State.

MR. JACOBY (Derbyshire, Mid.): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the attention of His Majesty's Government has been called to the expediency of establishing a Consular Court in the interests of British subjects resident in the Congo State; and, if so, whether they will take steps to carry out the proposal.

(*Answered by Earl Percy.*) The question of the adequacy of existing safeguards for the protection of British interests in the Congo is receiving the careful consideration of His Majesty's Government.

Report on Indian Police.

MR. WEIR: To ask the Secretary of State for India whether he is now in a position to say when the Report on the Police of India will be laid upon the Table of the House.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) I have nothing to add to the answers I gave to the hon. Member for West Denbighshire on the 20th April, and the hon. Member for Hull (Central Division) on the 21st idem.†

Indian Official Secrets Bill—Points of Objection.

MR. WEIR: To ask the Secretary of State for India if he will state the two points in the Official Secrets Bill which were objected to by three of the members of the Select Committee.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) I would refer the hon. Member to the Report of the Select Committee, which he will find in the Gazette of India for the 6th February last. A copy of the Gazette is in the Library of the House.

Publication of Lord Kitchener's Memorandum on the Indian Army.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): To ask the Secretary of State for India if the recent Memorandum of Lord Kitchener upon the Army in India and the Volunteer Forces in India can be issued for the information of Members.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxxxiii., 681 and 841.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) I will lay on the Table copies of Lord Kitchener's Memorandum on the Indian Army if my hon. friend will move for them. I am not aware of any Memorandum by Lord Kitchener upon the Volunteer Force in India, but I have seen a report of a speech in which he urged Europeans in India to join in the Volunteer movement.

Ireland—Office of Public Trustee.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if the office of the Public Trustee has been formally opened yet; and, if so, what appointments have been made in it, with the qualifications of the persons so appointed; and, if no such appointments have yet been made, is it his intention to allow the Public Trustee to select applicants of ability and experience, and with special technical knowledge of the requirements of such a department.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The office of the Public Trustee has been opened at No. 12, Upper Merrion Street. He is assisted by a gentleman who has had considerable official experience.

Clare Agricultural Committee—Appointment of Miss Freeman.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can explain the reasons why Miss Freeman was not appointed instructress in dairy keeping and butter making in county Clare by the Agricultural and Technical Department; whether he is aware that Miss Freeman had been elected to the position of dairy instructress by the County Clare Agricultural and Technical Committee in November, 1902, and that Miss Freeman obtained first place and a silver medal at an examination held at the end of a course of training in the Munster Dairy School, Cork, in 1898, and later a pass with distinction in the University College, Reading; and whether, under all these circumstances, he will see that her appointment is sanctioned, and so remove the deadlock now existing between the Department and the County Committee.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) Miss Freeman was one of ten candidates for appointment as instructors in butter making under County Committees in Ireland who were examined on 6th April at Cork by the Department's Inspector. The Inspector reported that none of those examined on that occasion possessed the necessary qualifications, and as all appointments under county schemes are subject to approval by the Department the selection of Miss Freeman by the County Committee could not be sanctioned. The gaining of the medal and of the certificate referred to is no indication of qualification for the appointment in question. The holding of a diploma or certificate will not exempt a person from examination by the Department.

New Course for Admission to the Army.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: To ask the Secretary of State for War if the new course for admission to the Army has been decided upon, and, in such case, what subjects it includes, and if Greek and other dead languages have been discarded in favour of natural science and military history and geography in accordance with the recommendations of the Military Education Committee.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) The new syllabus for examinations to be held in November, 1905, and after that date, has been decided on and has been published for general information. There will be in future two examinations to be passed by candidates for the Army. The first provides for every candidate being qualified up to a given standard of general education before he enters for the competitive examination for entrance into Woolwich or Sandhurst, and includes the following three obligatory subjects: English, English History and Geography, Mathematics (elementary), and, in addition, two out of the three following subjects: Science, French or German, Latin or Greek. The second examination is the competitive examination for Sandhurst and Woolwich, and includes for Woolwich three compulsory subjects, viz.: English, either French or German, Mathematics I., and any two of the following: Mathematics II., Science, History, German or French, Greek or Latin; for Sandhurst, two compulsory subjects, viz.: English, French or German, and any two of the following: Mathematics I., Mathematics II., Science, History, German or French, Greek or Latin. Both for Woolwich and Sandhurst a small proportion of marks will also be allotted for Freehand Drawing as a voluntary subject.

Rifle Range Accommodation at Rugby.

Mr. CORRIE GRANT (Warwickshire, Rugby): To ask the Secretary of State for War why the Rugby School Volunteer Corps are allowed to use the rifle range at Rugby while it has been closed as unsafe to the Rugby Volunteers; and whether, as the Town Volunteers have now to travel twenty-seven miles to Stratford for a range, there is any prospect that a nearer range will be found for them.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) The hon. Member has been somewhat misinformed. Instructions have been given that the range should be opened for this year for general practice for the local Volunteers as well as the Rugby School Corps, at 200 yards only, and for practice for those who intend to compete in competitions at Bisley up to 400 yards. Further permission has been granted to the School team to practice for the Ashburton Shield up to 500 yards. The officer commanding this Volunteer battalion of the Warwickshire Regiment is negotiating for another range.

Army Pensions—Case of Matthew Meath.

Mr. NOLAN (Louth, S.): To ask the Secretary of State of War whether he is aware that Matthew Meath enlisted, in Drogheda, in the 10th Regiment of Infantry in 1860, and was discharged after twelve-and-a-half years service without a pension; and, if so, will he state why his application to the War Office for relief of some kind has been refused.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) This man served for eleven years 187 days, of which period one year 172 days were forfeited in reckoning service for pension. His conduct was indifferent, his name appears forty-four times in the regimental defaulter book, and he was ten times tried by Court-martial. He gave no war service, and was discharged at his own request. Accordingly there is no regulation under which he could be awarded a pension, and he was so informed on the 3rd instant by the Commissioners of Chelsea Hospital.

Private Soldiers Discharged on Permanent Pensions.

Mr. NOLAN: To ask the Secretary of State for War if he will state the numbers, for the past seven years, of private soldiers discharged on permanent pensions after twenty-one years service; of non-commissioned officers, including warrant officers, discharged on pension after same period of service; and the average amount of pension in each case.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) The figures are as follows:—

Year.	Warrant Officers.		Non-commissioned Officers.		Privates.	
	Number discharged with 21 years service and upwards.	Average daily rate of pension.	Number discharged with 21 years service and upwards.	Average daily rate of pension.	Number discharged with 21 years service and upwards.	Average daily rate of pension.
		s. *d.*		*s.* *d.*		*s.* *d.*
1996–1897	114	3 10¾	670	2 4	226	1 1¼
1897–1898	96	3 11¼	792	2 3¾	288	1 1
1898–1899	84	3 9½	892	2 4½	224	1 1
1899–1900	82	3 11¼	615	2 5¼	178	1 1¼
1900–1901	58	3 8	431	2 4¾	125	1 1¼
1901–1902	83	3 10	785	2 5	274	1 2
1902–1903	115	3 8½	1,262	2 3¼	519	1 0¾

Public Works Loans—Extension of Time of Repayment.

MR. CROOKS: To ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether his attention has been called to the fact that the Public Works Loan Commissioners refuse to grant loans for a period beyond fifty years, notwithstanding the Housing Act of 1903 extended the period of repayment from sixty to eighty years; and, if so, will he endeavour to amend the Act or issue an Order to enable the Commissioners to extend the period of repayment.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) I am not prepared to propose legislation for extending the maximum period for repayment of loans by the Public Works Loan Commissioners.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Militia Encampment Dining Tents.

MR. LYELL (Dorsetshire, East): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, in view of the fact that dining tents which for the last twelve years have always been provided for Militia battalions, have lately been refused, and in view of the discomfort caused by compelling Militiamen to eat in the small tents in which they have to sleep and keep and clean all their uniforms, accoutrements, and arms, he will reconsider his decision, so as to prevent any prejudicial effect on recruiting for the Militia.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): Will the hon. Member kindly refer to my reply to a similar Question† put yesterday by the hon. Member for Dewsbury?

MR. COURTENAY WARNER (Staffordshire, Lichfield): Is it the intention of the War Office to give men who have absolutely no knowledge of Militia matters entire control over the recruiting?

[The answer was inaudible.]

Army Expenditure.

*MR. A. K. LOYD (Berkshire, Abingdon): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he can state how much of the increase in the normal annual expenditure on the Army was due to the provision of increased pay of soldiers and to improved barrack accommodation.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I will answer this Question. The first part of the hon. Member's Question is somewhat indefinite, as no periods are stated between which the comparison is to be made. The greater part of the improved barrack accommodation is borne by Loan Funds and is not charged in the Annual Estimates. As stated in my Memorandum to the Estimates 1904–5, there is an increase of £750,000 for the grant of service pay.

MR. A. K. LOYD: If I put dates to the Question will the right hon. Gentleman give me a more precise answer?

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: Yes, Sir, I shall be very happy to give the best information I can on the matter.

Chinese Coolies for the Transvaal—Accommodation at Hong-Kong.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies, in view of the fact that the cubicle system prevails in Chinese houses, Hong-Kong, and that each house usually accommodates two or three hundred lodgers, will he state whether buildings have yet been completed near Kowloon for the isolation of the Chinese coolies who are awaiting shipment for the Transvaal; and will he say how many coolies are awaiting shipment.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. LYTTELTON, Warwick and Leamington): I have no further information beyond what I have given in replying to the hon. Member's Question on 9th May.‡

MR. WEIR: Are the coolies now occupying these cubicles?

MR. LYTTELTON: My answer covers that.

---

† See page 173.

‡ See (4) *Debates*, cxxxiv., 756.

Mr. ALFRED DAVIES (Carmarthen Boroughs): How many coolies are awaiting shipment?

[No answer was returned.]

British Indian Traders in the Transvaal.

Sir MANCHERJEE BHOWNAGGREE (Bethnal Green, N.E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he is aware that in the matter of an application to the Supreme Court of the Transvaal of a British Indian resident for an order to compel the local authorities to grant a trading licence, the Government there offered opposition, citing in support of their contention a decision of the old Boer Court, against which the Colonial Office itself had protested at the time; that the Supreme Court did not regard that decision as binding, and gave judgment in favour of the applicant; whether the action of the local Government in this case has been approved by the Colonial Office; and, if not, will he ask the local Government to explain why they are having recourse now to old Boer decisions and legislation to which the Colonial Office has formerly objected in matters concerning British Indian residents.

*Mr. LYTTELTON: The position is as my hon. friend states, except that no protest was, so far as I am aware, made against the decision of the High Court of the late South African Republic by the Colonial Office. I am informed that the Supreme Court of the Transvaal has given judgment in a test case brought on behalf of the British Indian traders to compel the Government to issue trading licences, and that the Court gave judgment in favour of the applicant, refusing to be bound in the matter by the decision above mentioned of the High Court of the late South African Republic. The action of the local Government in having their position argued on the basis of the existing law and its interpretation by the late Supreme Court was not referred for approval by the Colonial Office, and I do not see what other course they could have followed. The attitude of the local Government and the reasons for it were made clear by the despatch from Lord Milner of 11th May last published in Cd. 1684. The position to be taken up by His Majesty's Government in the matter has been the subject of correspondence between the Colonial Office and the India Office, and the judgment of the Supreme Court will now be taken into consideration in arriving at a decision upon this difficult subject.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): Is it not the fact that meantime British Indian subjects are being deprived of their civil rights in the matter of trading in the Transvaal?

*Mr. LYTTELTON: I am not aware that they are being deprived of their rights. On the contrary, the test case brought by them has been decided in their favour in the Transvaal Courts.

Sir MANCHERJEE BHOWNAGGREE: How long will it take to modify the old Boer legislation? Correspondence on this matter has now been going on for five years.

The Tibetan Expedition.

Mr. FLYNN (Cork, N): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether China, as the suzerain Power, has yet officially intimated its assent to the proposed armed expedition to Lhasa; and, if so, on what date and through what official channel was such assent conveyed to the Indian Government.

The UNDER-SECRETARY of STATE for FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Earl Percy, Kensington, S.): It has not been considered necessary to make a formal communication to the Chinese Government on the subject of the intended advance to Lhasa. The hon. Member will find at pages 146, 148, 218, 297, 299, 301, and 307 of the Blue-book the communications which have passed between the Foreign Office and the Chinese Government on the subject of the advance of Colonel Younghusband's Mission into Tibetan territory. Sir E. Satow has more recently been in communication with the Chinese Government on the same subject.

Mr. FLYNN: Is it not the fact that the Chinese Government, though they sanctioned an advance to the frontier, have not yet sanctioned the advance of an armed expedition to Lhasa?

Earl PERCY: We have not received any communication from the Chinese Government on that subject. The hon. Member will see from the Blue-book that the Chinese Government formally notified their assent to the holding of a conference at Yatung.

Mr. FLYNN: But has the Chinese Government notified its official sanction to the advance of the expedition to Lhasa?

Earl PERCY: I have said we have received no communication whatever on the subject.

Perjury in the Clerkenwell County Court.

Mr. BRYN ROBERTS (Carnarvonshire, Eifion): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the statement of Judge Edge, at the Clerkenwell County Court on Monday last, that the amount of perjury committed in that Court is appalling, and that in almost every case there is perjury on one side or the other, and whether he proposes to take some steps to suppress the perjury that is thus authoritatively stated to be prevalent in English Courts of Law.

The SECRETARY of STATE for the HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. Akers-Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's): I have seen a report of the Judge's remarks; but I am not aware of any action I can take in the matter. The law already provides severe penalties for the crime of perjury; and the Director of Public Prosecutions is ready to take proceedings in any case brought to his notice by a Judge where there is a reasonable prospect of a prosecution being successful; but the difficulty in the way of securing convictions is the inherent difficulty of obtaining the requisite evidence.

Post Office Vote, Subhead E II.

Mr. WEIR: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General, having regard to the fact that there has been no great increase recently in the number of accounts to be dealt with by the Post Office Savings Bank, will he explain why, under Subhead E 11 of the Post Office Vote, a sum of £87,500 has been set down for Post Office Savings Bank postage, 1904–5, an increase of £14,500 as compared with the previous year.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Lord Stanley, Lancashire, Westhoughton): The Estimate of the cost of Savings Bank postage for 1903–4 was framed on the assumption that the passing of the Savings Bank and Friendly Societies Bill would relieve the Postmaster-General of the obligation to acknowledge deposits of less than £1 in amount, and thus reduce the postage. As, however, this Bill was not proceeded with, the relief was not obtained and the expenditure proved to be about £14,600 more than the Vote. The Estimate for the current year was framed so as to provide against such an excess. If the Savings Bank Acts Amendment Bill, now before the House, becomes law this session the case will, of course, be altered.

Light Dues.

Sir ALBERT ROLLIT (Islington, S): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether, having regard to the accumulation of the Lighthouse Fund, a further reduction in the Light Dues may be expected, and, if so, when.

The PRESIDENT of the BOARD of TRADE (Mr. Gerald Balfour, Leeds, Central): The hon. Member is no doubt aware that by an Order in Council which came into force on the 1st April, 1903, the dues were reduced by 12½ per cent. In consequence of this abatement the balance on the Fund has been reduced by some £30,000 in the course of 1903–4, and decreases of a substantial amount are anticipated during the next two or three years. Until further experience has been gained of the effect of the existing abatement, I am not in a position to promise a reduction in the dues.

Mr. AUSTIN TAYLOR (Liverpool, East Toxteth): Can the right hon. Gentleman say what the balance is now?

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: About £400,000. Of this, however, about £80,000 is already bespoken.

Brighton Vaccination Regulations.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he is aware that, although forms are framed by the Local Government Board for distribution to the parents of new-born infants, the vaccination officer for Brighton has induced the superintendent registrar to issue a form in which the vaccination officer gives his private advice in regard to vaccination; and, if so, will steps be taken by the Local Government Board to ensure their forms being issued intact.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. WALTER LONG, Bristol, S.): I understand that the Guardians of the Parish of Brighton recently had this subject before them, and resolved that Vaccination Notices should be issued in the form previously in use in the parish, with the omission of a notice printed on it to the effect of its being advisable that children should be vaccinated between the second and third months after birth. I am not aware of any sufficient reason for objecting to the document as altered, and I do not propose to interfere in the matter.

MR. WEIR: Then am I to understand that such a document as this can be sent out as a Government notice?

MR. WALTER LONG: Certainly, there is nothing on the paper to which I have a right to object.

Buckingham County Council Rate.

MR. ALFRED DAVIES: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board, seeing that the Buckingham County Council has recently levied a rate and refused to give general details, if he will give them to the House, or say how they can be obtained.

MR. WALTER LONG: I am not in possession of the details referred to, nor am I empowered to require the county council to give them. I can only suggest that the hon. Member should communicate with the council on the subject.

Grants to Elementary Schools.

SIR W. HART DYKE (Kent, Dartford): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether the alterations made in the payment of the annual grant to elementary schools in the new Education Code will cause any reduction in the amount now earned, and whether any estimate has been made by the Board of Education which can afford some assurance upon the subject.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir WILLIAM ANSON, Oxford University): After a very careful inquiry into the probable effect of the change in the block grant proposed in the new Code, the Board have estimated that the total amount paid is not likely to be affected, and that variations in the case of individual schools will make no practical difference in the total amount of grants paid to local authorities for the maintenance of the schools in their area.

MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE (Somersetshire, E.): Has the hon. Gentleman considered the effect of these changes on rural schools where the children are not usually kept in attendance until they are fifteen years of age?

SIR WILLIAM ANSON: Yes, we have considered the general effect on the different areas of the change, and in this particular I think I can reassure my right hon. friend.

Roads at Lochs, Island of Lewis.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether he is aware that Dr. Cameron, the medical officer of health for the parish of Lochs, Island of Lewis, states that 1,500 persons residing on the south side of Loch Erisort have no roads or footpaths communicating with the main road; and, if so, will the Congested Districts Board make some inquiry with a view to provide a grant for the construction of footpaths in the district.

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire): It does not lie wih the Congested Districts Board to initiate inquiries in the direction indicated by the hon. Member, but any application for additional roads or footpaths should come through the responsible authorities, when the merits of each individual case will be carefully examined.

Dublin College of Science—Architects' Remuneration.

MR. MOONEY (Dublin County, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury what is the rate of remuneration at which the joint architects for the proposed College of Science, Dublin, Mr. Webb and Mr. Deane, have been employed.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY (Mr. VICTOR CAVENDISH, Derbyshire, W.): The architects will receive between them the usual commission of 5 per cent.

MR. MOONEY: Will they each receive it?

MR. VICTOR CAVENDISH: No, between them.

The Kingston Estate,

*MR. WILLIAM ABRAHAM (Cork County, N.E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the original terms for the sale of the Kingston Estate were proposed by the agent for the property, and were submitted to a meeting of the tenants held in Mitchelstown on 6th December last and rejected unanimously; that the subsequent counter-proposals of the tenants were not accepted by the landlord; that processes for ejectments were issued against forty tenants in January, and that nearly all the tenants were notified early in March to pay up a year's rent, unless the landlord's proposal of twenty-three years purchase of first-term rents was accepted; and, if so, if he will bring these matters under the notice of the Estates Commissioners.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): The original terms of sale offered by the agent were formulated in reply to an application made through the parish priest. These terms were rejected by the tenants on the 6th December. The counter-proposals of the tenants were formulated on the same date and were not accepted. Only one ejectment process has since been issued, and this was at the request of the tenant, for the purpose of proving title. No notices such as referred to at the end of the Question have been issued. The ordinary rent circulars were issued to tenants in March for the rent due to the previous September. This is the annual practice.

MR. WILLIAM ABRAHAM: Does the right hon. Gentleman adhere to his statement made in answer to a Question on the 11th instant that the Kingston Tenants repudiated their own terms of purchase?

Bicycle Thefts in Dublin.

MR. MOONEY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if his attention has been called to the arrest and remand of a man named Ferns, otherwise Brown, on the charge of stealing two bicycles in Dublin, and having sold them to two members of the Royal Irish Constabulary at Rathcoole, county Dublin; and whether, in view of the fact that this is a case of great importance, and as the police themselves are concerned in the matter, he will take the prosecution out of their hands, and have the Crown legally represented in Court at the next hearing so that the full facts may be elicited.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Crown will be legally represented in this case on the hearing of the remanded charges.

Cooscroum Landing Stage.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the improvement in the landing stage at Cooscroum, county Kerry, provided by the Congested Districts Board after a delay of over two years, consists of a frame of which the total length is thirteen and a half feet, although the thirty boats for which it is required have a keel length each of twenty-four feet; can he state what is the total cost of this contrivance; and whether the Congested Districts Board will provide proper facilities for assisting the fishermen at this spot.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Board has provided three frames carrying rollers for this landing place. Two of these will be in use simultaneously, whilst the third will be carried ahead to receive the boat as it moves forward. The total cost of the appliance will be £10. Applications for the construction of piers or boatslips are considered in the order of their relative importance, and there is no prospect that further funds will be available for expenditure at this spot for some years.

Assistant Teachers in Irish National Schools.

Mr. MURPHY (Kerry, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland when the average attendance is to be reduced in the national schools from sixty to fifty, to entitle such schools to the services of an assistant.

Mr. WYNDHAM: I replied to a similar Question addressed to me on the 11th instant by the hon. Member for West Kerry.†

Killorglin Evicted Tenant.

Mr. MURPHY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if an application for reinstatement has been received from Francis Butler, of Coolbane, Killorglin, by the Estates Commissioners; and whether, having regard to the fact that negotiations for a sale of the estate on which his farm is situated are proceeding, the Commissioners have taken any steps to secure his reinstatement.

Mr. WYNDHAM: Yes, Sir; an application has been received from this man and will be considered.

Mr. MURPHY: Will the right hon. Gentleman direct the attention of the Estates Commissioners to this case?

Mr. WYNDHAM: No doubt their attention has been called to it.

Listowel and Tarbert Coach Contract.

Mr. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can give the names of the parties in Listowel and Tarbert, and others, who tendered for the contract to carry out coach service at present in existence between Listowel and Tarbert; and whether he will also give the amount which each person tendered for.

Mr. WYNDHAM: I am in communication with the Board of Works in this matter and will communicate with the hon. Member on the subject.

North Kerry Fisheries.

Mr. FLAVIN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that a petition was presented a short time since to the Congested Districts Board by the fishermen of Beale and Gullane, in North Kerry, praying for the building of a boatslip and other facilities in connection with the fishing industry in that district; and whether, seeing that Gullane, where the proposed facilities are asked for, is a congested electoral division in North Kerry, and that the Congested Districts Board have spent no money in North Kerry since 1897, he will say what action the Congested Districts Board will take in connection with this petition.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The Congested Districts Board is in correspondence with the Department of Agriculture on the subject of this application. I am inquiring into the matter and will communicate the result to the hon. Member.

Ballinasloe Asylum Medical Officer.

Mr. SLOAN (Belfast, S): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the fact that, at a meeting of the committee of management of the Ballinasloe District Asylum, held on the 9th instant, a letter was read from the Lord-Lieutenant asking to be informed why, in electing Dr. Kirwan to the vacant office of resident medical superintendent, they had passed over the senior assistant medical officer of the Asylum; and, if so, can he state whether information was refused to the Lord-Lieutenant; and, if so, what action, if any, does he intend to take in the matter.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The effect of the Lord-Lieutenant's letter is correctly stated in the first part of the Question.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxxxiv., 1022.

The request for information was not refused. The committee of management questioned the right of the Lord-Lieutenant to invite them to give reasons, and stated that Dr. Kirwan, the junior assistant, had "been duly" appointed by them. Section 84 (4) of the Local Government (Ireland) Act, 1898, provides that the resident medical superintendent shall not be appointed without the concurrence of the Lord-Lieutenant. The statement that Dr. Kirwan was duly appointed by the committee is therefore inaccurate, inasmuch as it is incomplete. The right vested with the Lord-Lieutenant of granting or with-holding his concurrence is unconditional. In exercising that right His Excellency discharges a duty imposed upon him by statute, and the duty is not limited to ascertaining whether the candidate, whose appointment is submitted, is possessed of the statutory qualifications for the post. The circumstances of each case must be considered. The committee have declared that Dr. Kirwan was elected because in their judgment he was considered to be the fittest for the position. The selection of a junior officer, however well qualified, is of doubtful expediency, but in view of the fact that promotion by seniority is not laid down in the Act, and though of general is not of universal advantage, His Excellency does not feel called upon to express an opinion on the view put forward by the Committee, who are primarily responsible. Under these circumstances His Excellency is not prepared to withhold his statutory concurrence in the appointment, and the committee have been informed accordingly.

Mr. SLOAN (Belfast, .): Were the qualifications of both these gentlemen equal ?

Mr. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.): Did not the Lord-Lieutenant recently lay down the principle that promotion should go by seniority ?

Mr. WYNDHAM said he believed the Asylum committee reported that the qualifications of the two candidates were equal. The committee exercised the discretion vested in them by Act of Parliament, and the Government did not feel called upon to interfere. It would not conduce to the proper working of local government in Ireland for the Executive to intervene when not called upon to do so by statute.

Marine Insurance Bill.

Sir ALBERT ROLLIT: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury when the Marine Insurance Bill will be re-introduced; and whether, having regard to the fact that the Bill has passed through all its stages in the House of Lords in previous sessions, he will arrange that it shall be brought into this House in time to go through Committee, and, if approved, become law during the present session.

The PRIME MINISTER and FIRST LORD of the TREASURY (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.): We think it very desirable that this Bill should pass, and intend to re-introduce it shortly after the holidays.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act for rendering compulsory the use of the system of Weights and Measures commonly known as the Metric System." [Weights and Measures (Metric System) Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act for the better Prevention of Corruption." [Prevention of Corruption Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to amend Section eighty-two of The Bills of Exchange Act, 1882." [Bills of Exchange Act, 1882, Amendment Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act for amending the Law relating to the Administration of Oaths for the purpose of Proceedings in Prize Courts." [Prize Courts Bill [Lords.]

NEW BILL.

JUDICATURE AND DEVELOPMENT GRANT (IRELAND) BILL.

"To augment the Ireland Development Grant by means of the abolition of two Judgeships and the reduction of the Salary of the Lord Chancellor, and the transfer of certain Accumulations, and to make provision with respect to the application of a portion of that Grant," presented by Mr. Wyndham; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 1st June, and to be printed. [Bill 215.]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (SUPPLY).

Ordered, That the Motion for the Adjournment of the House for Whitsuntide have precedence this day of the Business of Supply.—(*Mr. A. J. Balfour*).

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE (WHITSUNTIDE).

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 31st May."—(*Sir A. Acland-Hood*).

Dr. **FARQUHARSON** (Aberdeenshire, W.) called attention to the effect of the Rules under which they had now been working for some time. In his opinion the time had come for the appointment of a Committee to inquire into the subject, which was of paramount importance to the efficiency of the House. Had they had such a Committee at the outset the Prime Minister would have been saved a good deal of trouble and very valuable information could have been obtained from the Speaker, from the Leader of the House, and from the Leader of the Opposition. Only within the last day or two they had had illustrations of what he considered to be the unsatisfactory character of one of the new Rules, under which it had been found possible to bring in a Bill, making a most important change in the Lunacy Law of this country, without a word of explanation from the Attorney-General, who was responsible for the measure, which was the outcome of a debate in Committee a few nights previously. Personally he had never known a case of such speedy legislation, and he did think the House should be informed of the nature of the Government proposals. There were many Members who found it most inconvenient to be at the House at two o'clock—especially those gentlemen who were in business or professional life, while there were others who found the luncheon hour at home was the only opportunity they had of talking with their families, and who certainly preferred a cut of mutton off the family joint to a dry biscuit at the House. The House of Commons ought not to be a place accessible only to men of leisure who wished to enlarge their social circle. Under present conditions it was impossible for any man carrying on commercial or City life, or practising in the Law Courts, to come to the House before four or five o'clock, when the interesting questions were over. The only thing which worked well in the new Rules was the arrangement for Motions for Adjournment. This whole question was one of supreme importance not only to the comfort of Members, but to the dignity of the House. He confessed that he was not a week-ender, but what he really used to like very much was the adjournment in the middle of the week, and he thought it would be found that the officials of the House would be very glad to get back to the old arrangement. Four or five long and harassing days consecutively placed a great strain on Ministers and officials, for which he thought the week-end was no relief. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman, who had always paid such courteous attention to appeals from hon. Members, would consent to the appointment of this Committee.

The **PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY** (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.): The hon. Member opposite made so courteous an appeal to me on the subject of the new Rules and their working that I feel constrained to rise at once, not to discuss the matter at great length, but shortly to indicate the view which I have always held and still hold upon the subject. Let me say, in the first place, that I think there is always a danger that those who are under a new system feel acutely any evils which it may carry with it, while they have completely forgotten, naturally, the pinch of the old Rules, the old state of things, from which the new state of things has enabled them to escape. The hon. Gentleman's first point related to the hour at which we commence business. I have several times indicated, in answer to Questions, that I do not regard that as a fundamental or essential part of the system of the new Rules, and that I should not regard some alleviation—I suppose that is the word which the right hon. Gentleman would like—of the rigid Rule which brings us down here for Questions at a quarter-past two as in any way fundamentally altering the system which this House adopted three years ago. But I must frankly remind him that there are difficulties in the way. In the first place, I think the whole House will admit that the diminution in the number of oral Questions is really an advantage to everybody. How has that diminution come about? It has partly come about through a modification in our old Rules to which I think no objection is taken, the modification which enables a certain number of Questions to be put unstarred, so that a Minister can give a written answer instead of an oral answer. I wish I could be quite sure that it is all due to that. I am not positive that the domestic considerations to which the hon. Gentleman delicately alluded at one part of his speech, which keep, so he told us, a family man at home at the hour at which Questions take place, may not induce a certain number of Gentlemen to put Questions unstarred which they would be more inclined to put across the floor of the House if they could at once have conversation with their wives and children and come down to the House in time. Therefore I am not sure that this kind of natural protection, which diminishes full free trade in Questions, may not have some indirect advantages for the general convenience of the House.

But there is another consideration to which I would specially call the hon. Gentleman's attention and the attention of other Members. It is the need of having at our afternoon sitting, before half-past seven, really adequate time in which to hold a debate of even considerable importance. If the reforms, or anything like the reforms, of my hon. and gallant friend the Member for the Chelmsford Division of Essex, who has been a protagonist in the movement for short speeches, were carried out, or if apart from any specific Rule, hon. Members would consent in a general debate to cut down their speeches to that part of the subject in which they took special interest, and in which they might not be absolutely certain that they were repeating things that had been said before and anticipating things that would inevitably be said after, then I think we might shorten our sittings. But there seems some absolutely inevitable tendency in human nature—I do not at all pretend that I am free from it—there seems some inevitable tendency for every speaker to survey the whole subject from beginning to end, to deal with the commonplaces, which are commonplaces because they are common to every speaker on the subject, instead of devoting himself to what, from his own interest in it, would probably have some novelty to the House, welling, as it were, out from the heart of the speaker and not merely from his memory. But if that were done, either by the imposition of an artificial Rule or by the self-discipline of the 670 Gentlemen who compose this Assembly, then I think we might shorten our sittings. But I would venture seriously to suggest, both to independent Members and to any Gentlemen who may hereafter have to reconsider the Rules of the House, not rashly to endeavour unduly to cut short what is the longest and most important part of the day's Parliamentary work. The hon. Gentleman told us, and I have no doubt with some truth, that the early meeting was especially burdensome to professional men—lawyers and others—who have occupations which require their attendance in their places of business. I will make two observations on that. In the first place, I would point out that that only deals with London. A very large number, I suppose in fact the majority, of Members of this House who are engaged in business are not engaged in business in London. Their home and their place of business are in the provinces, and, make what hours of Parliamentary business you choose, you cannot wholly meet their case. The nearest thing to meeting their case that has yet been arrived at is that very week-end arrangement to which the hon. Gentleman, I think, raises some objections. Many Members whose business is not in London but in the provinces have informed me that, although, of course, that arrangement does not enable them to go day by day to their offices, it does enable them, as it were, to keep an eye week by week upon their offices; and a large number of people who cannot afford a house in London and in the provinces, and who desire that their families should live in their homes in the provinces, are enabled to carry out that domestic life for which the hon. Member, from an exterior point of view pleads this afternoon, solely because the Friday arrangement has been instituted under our new Rules. Although I admit that it is a balance of advantage and disadvantage, although I entirely agree with the hon. Member that the strain of four days consecutively is greater than the strain of four full days divided by a half-day, I think the other circumstances to which I have adverted really weigh the balance down to the side which the new Rules favour.

As regards the actual continuous labour of Parliamentary work, I, from the accident of a particular situation, have perhaps as much opportunity of measuring it as any other man in this House, because during the autumn session on the Education Bill there was no other business before the House, there was no relief to the Minister in charge of the Bill, and I had to conduct that Bill—not an easy Bill to conduct, as those who remember our discussions will admit—I had to conduct it five days in succession, not one week or two weeks, but many weeks successively, and, although I admit that the strain was very great, the fact that I am still alive to address the hon. Gentleman shows that it need not necessarily be fatal. There is one other point connected with his objection to early afternoon sittings to which I may call his attention. He seems to suppose that the early hours of the afternoon are the most difficult hours for Members to attend, and that the later hours are easier. As a matter of fact I am informed that the attendance is greater in the afternoon, and even in the early hours of the afternoon, than it is at the Evening Sitting, from which I come to the conclusion that the domestic attractions to which the hon. Gentleman refers are of a high character. Many Gentlemen find it difficult to return to the House at nine o'clock unless there is some special excitement or some hope of an interesting scene such as filled the House to overflowing on a very recent occasion. About the Evening Sitting, may I answer one argument which has been touched upon, but not pressed, that it is very hard to get Members back to the Chamber in time. The hon. Member said the Whips have a most laborious task. I do not suppose that the Whips on either side of the House have an easy time. They never have had in my Parliamentary career, but the removal of the old difficulty of the dinner hour, the crowding into quite inadequate dining rooms, the having a count always moved between fish and joint, and the absolute giving up of any power of change of scene and surroundings during the course of a long sitting, outweighs any difficulties—though the difficulties are quite real—incident to the recommencement of business at nine o'clock.

That, I think, deals broadly with most of the objections which the hon. Gentleman feels to the new system of things. He ended by asking a Committee. There had been a great many Committees, no doubt, in the business of this House, and voluminous evidence, never acted on, has been taken by those Committees. After all, a Committee of this House usually meets and deliberates in order that it may inform the House on a subject on which the House itself has not adequate means of information, but the Rules of the House are perhaps the one subject on which all the House has adequate means of information. [AN HON. MEMBER: No.] My hon. friend thinks hon. Members have not the means of full information, and he thinks that if a Committee sat and reported they would have that information. How would they have it? In a Blue-book. If they have not adequate means of information now it is because they do not read Blue-books or other official documents in which the whole case is contained. But in truth there is something better than Blue-books and Reports of Committees, and that is the personal experience of Members themselves. That experience is no doubt apt to be warped by circumstances to which I referred at the beginning of my speech. We feel the evils which are upon us, and forget the evils of which we have been relieved, but I do not think anything would be gained if the hon. Gentleman's Committee were granted. I have a more selfish reason, not necessarily selfish from a personal point of view, but another reason for regretting such a Committee unless the necessity were proved. Who is to sit upon that Committee? Mr. Speaker would no doubt be asked if he would consent to give evidence, but I do not know whether it is in accordance with precedent that he should be a member. The members would have to include the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the House.

*SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): That does not in itself condemn the Committee.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I think the right hon. Gentleman missed the earlier part of my remark. I was explaining to the House the absolute necessity that he and I should co-operate with the work of any Committee if its work is to be worth anything. I pay to our abilities that delicate compliment. But the labour would be very great. The Committee, I suppose, would be a Select Committee of eighteen, and must contain a very large number of the most important Members of the House. I confess that, unless the necessity for such a Committee were clearly proved I should personally feel the burden to be almost more than could be borne. I have already Committees more than enough on which in addition to my other work my presence is absolutely necessary. That is a small personal consideration which I do not really press upon the House. What I do press upon the House is that I believe the new Rules work well, that a Committee could not help us greatly to improve them, that, on the whole, Members of the House may make themselves acquainted with all the relevant circumstances, and that a Committee could do very little to aid them in coming to a final or satisfactory conclusion.

*MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis) said his right hon. friend had treated the subject with great good humour and some self-confidence. He said it was possible for every Member to acquaint himself with the Rules of the House. He himself entirely demurred to that, and he would give the right hon. Gentleman one instance to convince him that it could not be done. There was a Standing Order consisting of a nominative and no verb. That was a Standing Order which dealt with perhaps the most important thing a Standing Order could provide for, namely, cases of disorder in this House. No attempt had been made to complete it; it still remained in a truncated form, and no human being could understand either what it was or what it might become. The right hon. Gentleman must remember too, that there were first of all the Standing Orders of the House, and secondly the *lex non scripta*—the unwritten law of the House, which was really by far the most important part. He did say, and he thought anybody who knew the House would bear him out, that there was the very greatest difficulty in informing oneself as to the unwritten law, which was just as binding as the Standing Orders. He did not think anyone present could tell off-hand what was and what was not proper to be put into a Question, one of the most usual and apparently the most simple of things. There were many other things in regard to which hon. Members would be in very great doubt. Moreover the Rules seemed liable to infinite change. A practice had grown up of declaring suddenly, and without notice being given to Members of the House, that certain things which had always been done had fallen into desuetude, and could therefore no longer be done. He was not then challenging the propriety of that, but pointing out the complete uncertainty that resulted, and the consequent impossibility of knowing the Rule. When, for example, a Member proposed that the Clerk at the Table take down the words of another Member, he was suddenly told that it could not be done as the practice had fallen into desuetude. He defied anybody to have had any previous knowledge of that. The Clerk of the House had laid on the Table a new book containing the Rules of the House, or rather his views of the Rules of the House—a series of excellent pious opinions, but which derived their authority from and referred for it to May's text-book. Part of them, no doubt, referred to the Standing Orders. He believed it would be out of order to say anything derogatory of the Standing Orders, but if it were proper to do so, he would say that some of them were contradictory of each other, and that some of them were almost absurd in themselves. He would not, however, say that. The Rules were confusing to the ordinary Member. He had endeavoured to make himself acquainted with the Rules of the House, but he was in the greatest uncertainty constantly. Sometimes questions arose with respect to which he felt wholly unable to say what the position was, and but for the assistance received from Mr. Speaker about points of order no Member would be able to see his way through the maze.

He did not feel the objection which the right hon. Gentleman had to the appointment of a Committee. In his opinion a Committee would be able to take the common law and the Standing Orders and coordinate them—and would thus render inestimable service to the House. In regard to the new Rules the ladies were against the right hon. Gentleman to a woman. By these Rules he had destroyed London social life. The arrangements for Wednesday which formerly obtained had been abolished, and a great loss to Parliament was the result. Wednesday, when it was a private Members' day with its evening off, previously stood between the two first and the two last working days of the week. It used to be the day when they stood back from the picture and looked at the general effect. On that day consultations took place between Members of the same side and also between Members of different sides behind the Chair, and hon. Members came to useful compromises which were all for the benefit of Bills when they became Acts. Wednesday had not only been abolished Parliamentarily, but it had been abolished socially. Hostesses used to be able to count on Parliamentary diners on Wednesday, but they could no longer do that now that hon. Members had to attend the House on that evening. The new Rules had indeed professedly substituted Friday for Wednesday in the Parliamentary sense, but not socially. Everybody went out of town for the week-end. [AN HON. MEMBER: No.] Well, a very large number did. Sunday in London had consequently become a desert. He well remembered in his youth, the delightful Sunday afternoons for political gossip and the interchange of opinion. These had been abolished, to the great injury of this House and society; but that was nothing as compared with the injury to the Government itself under the new Rules. On Monday Members had not yet fully come back from their week-end holiday, and it could be seen that, being therefore always short of support on Monday, the Government dared not put down anything important for that day. On Friday, which was now the private Members' day, the Government men had gone off, and the Government had been repeatedly obliged to surrender in a way which under other circumstances they would not have done, to very dangerous and doubtful proposals embodied in private Members' Bills. Every Monday and every Friday was thus a dangerous day, and on every Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday the Government was in danger of being beaten daily between nine and half-past ten or eleven, and constantly had to put up Members to make speeches till their men got back from dinner. That was a condition of things which must be very trying to the Whips, and which would only be endurable to a Government with a majority of over a hundred. He would be very sorry for a Government which came to the House under the new Rules with a majority of under fifty. The new Rules had introduced the week-end, and had impaired in other ways the working power and the efficiency of the House in dealing with serious Bills. Take the dinner-hour, for instance. As long as the House went on sitting, as under the old Rules it did, with only an unavowed, unofficial, short interval for dinner taken when most convenient, then hon. Members thought it a duty to remain on the whole night. But now that, under the new Rules, the House rose and they were turned out at half-past seven o'clock, they went home, and the effect was that once hon. Members went home, the domestic charm was so great that they did not come back to the House. Who would come back, even if the hon. Member for the Isle of Wight was to speak, except from a strong sense of duty, or that the Whip of the Government said that if you remained longer at home the Government would be defeated or only saved by a narrow majority? That emptied the House and kept it empty, which was a very serious state of things.

But there were other even more serious defects in the management of the House. One was the constant diminution of the initiative of private Members, which had now reached such a point that practically all initiative was denied except to the Government, and that nothing could be debated unless brought forward by the Government. As a matter of fact, the private Member had little opportunity of raising what he thought were most important subjects for Parliamentary discussion. Under the present Parliamentary system the private Member had really and truly only three chances. First of all he might put down an Amendment to the Address. But when once the Address was passed that chance was gone for ever. Then, if he were lucky enough to succeed in the ballot, he might—though he himself had never been able to do it—put down a Motion for a Wednesday or Tuesday. But that was not altogether satisfactory, as they saw the previous night, when they had a private Member's motion superseded by the Prime Minister, whose Motion was actually a Motion of confidence in himself! Then there was the chance of moving the Adjournment. Formerly Members had the right to move the Adjournment of the House at any time in order to call attention to matters of urgent public importance. But that right had been much curtailed. It had besides been rendered completely useless by the monstrous practice of hon. Members putting down Motions on the Notice Paper on any subject that could interest any human being. He had been looking that day as to what subject was open to debate. He did not see any subject of any public interest which was not blocked out from an Adjournment Motion by notices of Motion not intended ever to be debated, and only put down to prevent debate. Consequently it was not possible to discuss preferential duties, War Office reform, the invasion of Tibet, Chinese labour, Macedonia, etc. The Notice Paper was covered in this manner, not honestly, but absolutely to prevent private Members using their rights to originate discussion on these questions. The whole effect of this scheme was that, practically, private Members had scarcely any opportunity of initiating discussion, and that the whole initiative was left to the Government. What the Government wanted to be discussed was discussed, and what they were not anxious to discuss could be put off indefinitely by adjournment blocking Motions set down by their friends. And their friends set them down. The hon. Member for Peckham, he observed, had an interesting Motion on the Paper to call attention to the British Mission to Tibet. The hon. Member had put that down not because he cared for Tibet more than other Members, but to prevent anyone moving the Adjournment of the House on that question. He commended these abuses of the forms of the House to his right hon. friend; and he earnestly besought him to take some opportunity to restore the very few and small chances left to private Members, by getting rid of the blocking Motion. The efficacy of this House depended on its Rules, and it was highly important that they should be put right, if wrong. He thought that, if not a large, a small Committee of Members of the House would be willing to give much of their time to make suggestions for the consolidation of the common law, the traditional law, and the Rules of the House. As a matter of fact, they did not know what were the Rules of the House, and how new Members could even put down a Question on the Paper in proper form was always a mystery to him. This matter was exceedingly important, and something ought to be done in regard to it.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The observations of the hon. Member have fallen upon me with the refreshing effect of a shower on the parched grass. We have been, in my opinion, suffering from the new Rules ever since they have been enacted. I am delighted to hear that the hon. Member seems to agree with me on many points. I confess, and I think that the right hon. Gentleman will remember that I have been from the first a heretic as to his main proposals. I am an anti-two-o'clocker, an anti-dinner-hourer, an anti-week-ender; and I believe that all these three alterations have had a most pernicious effect on the business and on the tone of the House. I entirely admit their blessed effect on the comfort of the individual Members. The dinner-hour is an enormous addition to the comfort and possibly to the domestic happiness of Members of Parliament; but, after all, we ought, I think, to have something higher than that in view. The right hon. Gentleman proclaimed when he introduced these Rules—and it was quite natural and most creditable to him that he should entertain that view—that as the hon. Members of the House had such heavy duties to perform, it was necessary to suit their personal convenience to a larger extent than was previously done. I admit the force of the argument, if it is consistent with the maintenance of the old traditions of the House of Commons. I do not think it is. I think the dinner-hour breaks up a long discussion, for instance, in Committee on a particular Bill, and gives obstructives, if there are any, a fresh wind, and makes it easier to obstruct. Then the two o'clock hour of meeting is, by universal consent, most inconvenient not only to men of business, but also to the ordinary mortal. It curtails his morning, which is the most important time for him, and interferes with the ordinary domestic arrangements as to the mid-day meal; and I think we see the effect of it in the afternoon audiences in the House. As to the week-end, it does the same thing, but on a much larger scale. It interrupts the life we lead here. Men go away, and again I am compelled to admit that it is an enormous convenience to the man engaged in business; but we must not consider the convenience or happiness of individual Members. It breaks up our ordinary routine, and then we get to think—we poor weak mortals as we are—that the duties and business of the House are almost a secondary matter. I say that the first business of every Member of the House should be Parliamentary, and whatever we may do to ease the burden we should not do anything to break down that feeling.

I will not go into the detail of the matter so skilfully dwelt upon by the hon. Member opposite. The elimination of the saving Wednesday, which broke the monotonous work of night after night, the attendance here which took away from us the night which was a great convenience for purposes which were not necessarily Parliamentary, but yet of public use—meetings and public functions which Members of Parliament have to give attention to—I pass from all these to the other question to which the hon. Gentleman has referred. We have had a very notable instance before us within the last few days. I mean the extraordinary position the House of Commons is in if one of its Members puts down an undated, indeterminate, and indefinite Motion. He can go away to fish for salmon, or on a yachting cruise, or pay a visit to South Africa for months, and he has completely checkmated the House of Commons. I do not quite agree with the hon. Gentleman as to the idea of restoring perfect freedom, almost amounting to anarchy, as to the moving the Adjournment of the House in the ordinary way.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I did not suggest that the old Rule should be revived. I suggested that a stop should be put to the practice of blocking Motions.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: What I say is that we do require some check on the irregular method of calling attention to urgent subjects. But there is one thing on which we require no check, and, if I am not mistaken, we are likely to suffer from it to-day; and that is, the putting down a pretended Motion by a Member which would prevent any other Member from calling attention to that subject. That applies not only to the irregular Motions of Adjournment of the House, but to the specific periodical Adjournment Motions for the holidays at Easter and Whitsuntide, which are the most necessary safety-valves, and opportunities afforded to the House of being able, periodically, as part of their regular and proper duties, to call attention to and provoke discussion upon any new current events and the general policy and conduct of the Government. We have an opportunity for discussing important matters, first of all in the debate on the Address, then on the Motion for the Easter holidays, then on the similar Motion with regard to the Whitsuntide holidays, and finally, on the Appropriation Bill. So that the House of Commons was furnished with at least four occasions when it was free to range over public topics, when Members could express their opinions, and obtain information from the Government.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The new Rules have not affected that.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I have now passed away from the new Rules, and am dealing with another subject. I say that those opportunities were an invaluable possession to the House of Commons, which it was in the interest of the country to preserve, and I submit that it is very desirable that some restriction should be placed upon the power of the individual Member to prevent the House of Commons from exercising that privilege, even if we allowed to the individual Member a little more latitude in the way of checking those irregular methods to which reference has been made.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) said the Leader of the Opposition and the hon. Member for Lynn Regis had performed a public service in calling attention to the scandal of the House of Commons being prevented, by blocking Motions, from discussing matters of the most urgent public importance. It was monstrous that a new departure such as the reversal of the Government policy in Tibet should not be open to the consideration of the House of Commons. That particular case was even stronger than that of native labour in the Transvaal, because, being paid for by India, it was not a subject that could be raised in Committee of Supply or on the Appropriation Bill; consequently, the House was reduced to the one opportunity afforded by the Indian Budget. Such a position was grotesquely absurd. The House had been discussing the new Rules, partly because it was unable to deal with the matters it desired to discuss, but there were matters more important than the abstract consideration of the new Rules and the convenience of Members, to which a little time might well be devoted. Government business was in an unprecedented condition. On the previous evening the discussion of the fiscal question had been prevented on the ground that it was more important to proceed with the business mentioned in the King's Speech. It was rather late in the session to talk about proceeding to deal with the business of the King's Speech. For the first time, he believed, in the history of the House of Commons, the Whitsuntide Recess had arrived without one of the Bills mentioned in the Speech from the Throne having entered upon the Committee stage. On the Easter Adjournment the Leader of the Opposition complained of the backward condition of those Bills; the position now was relatively worse, because, although a few of the measures had been introduced, with two exceptions they had been brought in under the "ten minutes" Rule or simply presented at the Table, and consequently had not been discussed at all. The result would be that, with the late starting of the session and the longer holidays, business would be crowded into the end of the session, the Twelve O'clock Rule would be continually suspended, the "compartment closure" would be invoked; and all these unconstitutional proceedings would have been forced upon the House not by obstruction, but by the backward condition of Government business. The first two Bills mentioned in the King's Speech—the Aliens Bill and the Licensing Bill—would take a considerable time, and while no one denied that a Valuation Bill was long overdue, it would be generally admitted that there was no chance of the Bill on that subject passing this session. With regard to the Housing of the Working Classes (Ireland) Bill, there had been a distinct breach of a pledge to the Irish Members, because they were promised last year that it should be one of the earliest and principal measures of the present session, but since its introduction under the "ten minutes" Rule, nothing had been heard of it. The Shops Bill had been merely presented, but the Compensation Bill was not even drafted. It was true that two Bills of importance not mentioned in the King's Speech had been introduced. The Anglo-French Agreement would not occupy much time, but the Welsh Coercion Bill would certainly be very strenuously fought.

The Government had urged the necessity of proceeding with these Bills as a reason for giving the go-by to other subjects to which the country attached the greatest importance, and which were in the minds of the people throughout the Empire. Since the Whitsuntide Adjournment last year and the 15th May preceding, when the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham declared that the Empire could be kept together only by dealing with these fiscal questions, a most dangerous disruptive element had been introduced into the Empire, which ought to be dealt with either by the House of Commons after full debate or by the country at a general election. It was impossible to shut one's eyes to the fact that while Australia and India were outside this question, it naturally excited a deep interest in the Dominion of Canada; and no one who understood the politics of the Dominion could deny that an element of danger had been introduced into the relations between the British Empire and the United States through the raising of this question. A Canadian policy was now being put forward for adoption which was not heard of a few years ago. Alternatives were suggested, such as an arrangement between Canada and the United States, which would be inconsistent with the position of the former in the British Empire, on the one hand, and proposals which the Prime Minister had declared would never be accepted by the working classes of this country, on the other. The Prime Minister stated at Sheffield that the working classes had had burnt into them by the sufferings of the past the same feeling as the French showed at the revolution of '89, and he plainly indicated the opinion that they would never submit to the taxation of food. In consequence of a blocking Motion he could not discuss the question of the taxation of food, but he submitted that it was the duty of the Government either to allow Parliament to judge of the question or to permit the country to express its opinion at a dissolution. As far as he understood their speeches, supporters of the Government were unwilling to go to the country because of the fear that the nation would go wrong on the question of South Africa and Ireland. There was a desire to keep the dead hand of the Tory Party over the Liberal Party, and to prevent the Liberal Party coming into its natural turn of office, unless hon. Members opposite were allowed to dictate their terms. The Government, doubtless, had a right to avoid a dissolution as long as they were supported by a majority of the House of Commons, but they had no right whatever to prevent Parliament from threshing out this question and of expressing its opinion—an opinion which he believed would be in accordance with the views which they on the Opposition side of the House entertained.

Mr. SAMUEL SMITH (Flintshire) asked whether the Prime Minister could tell the House if, under the altered conditions in Tibet, he was still able to renew the pledges given a short time ago that nothing would induce the Indian Government to establish a protectorate in Tibet nor send an expedition to Lhasa.

*__Mr. SPEAKER__: I am bound to say that the hon. Member will be precluded from discussing that question in consequence of the Motion that now stands Paper.

Sir EDWARD SASSOON (Hythe) drew the attention of the President of the Local Government Board to the increasing and embarrassing difficulties confronting local authorities in their efforts to abate the nuisance caused by the growth in the midst of popular resorts and in populous districts of consumptive homes or so-called sanatoria entirely unaccompanied by checks and safeguards suggested by the precautions of medical science. The local authorities had either to choose between acquiescence in the present state of things or embark upon costly litigation. Tuberculosis was one of the most infectious diseases that medical science had to contend against, and he pressed the right hon. Gentleman either to obtain further Parliamentary powers to deal with this great evil, or, if that was not possible, to indicate to the local authorities what steps should be taken to abate it.

*__Mr. HERBERT SAMUEL__ (Yorkshire, Cleveland) asked whether he would be in order in discussing Article 3 of the Anglo-Chinese Convention published that day, particularly the establishment of an "emigration agency" to be erected and fitted up by the British Government "at their expense."

*MR. SPEAKER said that under the Rules as they stood the hon. Member could not raise the question. The notice of Motion on the Paper would cover all questions of the conditions of service and of transportation affecting Chinese labourers for the Transvaal.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) urged that since the Motion had been placed on the Paper those new points in the Convention had arisen.

MR. WHITLEY (Halifax) asked whether the House was not entitled to raise the agreement which had been made to spend money before it had been voted by the House in Committee of Supply.

*MR. SPEAKER said that the question could also be discussed on the Motion on the Paper. It would be competent for the hon. Member to ask whether the money was being spent and what was the authority for the spending of it.

*MR. HERBERT SAMUEL said the condition in which the House found itself under blocking Motions of this character showed the immediate necessity of reconsidering the Rules of Procedure. It was scandalous that the blocking Motion put down upon the Paper weeks previously should preclude the House from discussing a treaty, copies of which had been circulated only that day. He wished to know if the money would be voted by the House of Commons.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. LYTTELTON, Warwick and Leamington) said that the expense would be the expense of the Transvaal Government, who would in turn charge the importer.

*MR. HERBERT SAMUEL said he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would be able to state from what source the money was in the first instance to be found; and, if it were to be voted by the House of Commons, under what Vote it would appear, and what opportunity for

the discussion of the question would be given. The statement of the right hon. Gentleman that the expense would be the expense of the Transvaal Government was not stated in the Convention. There it was clearly stated that the British Government would have to pay for the construction and maintenance of the dwellings in which the Chinese labourers were to be kept in strict confinement. As, however, he was precluded from discussing the merits of the question, he would revert to another matter mentioned by the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean. There were certain Bills mentioned in the King's Speech to which many of his hon. friends attached great importance. He would mention particularly the Shop Hours Bill, the Workmen's Compensation Act Amendment Bill, and the Public Health Bill. The Shop Hours Bill and the Workmen's Compensation Act Amendment Bill were the only measures of social reform relating to England which had been promised; they were to a great extent non-contentious, and if opposed at all would probably be opposed by hon. Gentlemen opposite. Undoubtedly, however, the Workmen's Compensation Act Amendment Bill, although non-contentious, as it would probably prove, as regarded its main principle, would require time for the consideration of its details. He expressed the hope that all the measures he had mentioned would be pressed forward at an early date. As regarded the housing question it would be remembered that an Act was passed last session enabling loans for building purposes to be repaid in a period of eighty years. That was a very valuable provision, but it was now discovered that the Public Works Loan Commissioners, from whom many of the local authorities, especially the smaller ones and those in rural districts, were accustomed to obtain their money, were not allowed to lend over a greater period than fifty years. That was a ridiculous situation which certainly ought to be ended.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. WALTER LONG, Bristol, S.) said, replying to the hon. Member for Hythe, that before he asked Parliament to clothe the Department or local authorities with such powers as had been suggested he must be satisfied that they were required. In the case of Sandgate, he could find that no such proof had been offered. Only forty-five deaths there were attributed to consumption, and of those forty-three were among the patients of this consumptives' home. Consumption was no doubt highly infectious; but how could a district be protected against infection by regulation? The home was not the cause of offence as a hospital was in the case of smallpox or cholera. The only practical suggestion which had been offered to reduce the risk of infection was to prevent the establishment of homes for consumptives; but that would be quite impossible. If the local authorities chose to establish such homes, no one could prevent them. It was an unfortunate characteristic of consumption that patients suffering from it were much more dangerous outside than they were in the homes, because the most fruitful source of spreading the disease was the sputa of the sufferers. Further, the patients were, up to a late stage of the disease, able to walk about and to some extent enjoy life; and it was while they were walking about that the danger arose. That might be dealt with by by-laws, and he was quite prepared to consider whether the county council or the district council should be the proper authority in the matter. He hoped the measures mentioned by the hon. Member for the Cleveland Division would be promptly proceeded with.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON said that according to the Rules of the House the only part they were allowed to discuss was this question of expense. He thought on that point this Convention required some further explanation from the Colonial Secretary. He understood that the new compounds were to be erected for these Chinamen by the British Government at our expense, but the right hon. Gentleman said that that was not the real meaning of the words, because the British Government in this connection was the Transvaal Government, and therefore these compounds were to be erected at their expense. He wished to know whether the expense would fall upon the Transvaal Government or upon the mineowners for whose benefit Chinese labour was going to be introduced. He also desired to know when they were going to have further Papers in regard to the regulations and terms of contract and the new regulations made under the Ordinance. They had had various Blue-books and certain regulations and terms of contract, but they had not yet had a complete copy of the Ordinance and regulations and terms of contract, and, therefore, they had no means of knowing how they stood. He thought he was entitled to press the right hon. Gentleman in this regard because they were not allowed to discuss this question on its merits but simply as an Amendment to the Address, when it was taken as a vote of censure. It was now three months since they were muzzled on that matter, and therefore he should like to know what had caused the delay, and why the House had not been placed in possession of the Ordinance and regulations as they stood at present. He trusted the right hon. Gentleman would be able to give them that information so that when the House reassembled they would be able to discuss the matter with full knowledge of the subject. It appeared to him that the Government did not want these questions discussed, for if they did they could easily get those blocking Motions taken off. He would not say that those Motions were put down at the instigation of the Government, but they were at any rate put down with their knowledge and approbation. The Government did not want anything discussed because they knew their position was a precarious one. He regretted that certain hon. Members put down Motions which were contrary to the views they held.

*Mr. JOSEPH WALTON (Yorkshire, W.R., Barnsley) said he wished to ask the Government to give them some information with regard to the Chinese Treaty Port of New-chwang. This country carried on a trade with that port amounting to £3,000,000 a year, and, up to a couple of days ago, for over four years it had been occupied and administered by the Russian Government, but our Japanese allies had succeeded, according to the newspapers, in causing the evacuation of that place by the Russian forces. The Japanese forces had not yet occupied that port, where there were many British subjects, and, therefore, it was important that the Government should take the necessary steps to protects the lives and property of British subjects, and make arrangements for British trade to be carried on there uninterruptedly during the war. He welcomed the success of the Japanese, because they were fighting the battle of the "open door," not only for themselves, but for this country as well in Manchuria. He wished to know what steps had been taken by the Government for the protection of the lives and property of British subjects at that port? He was aware that they could not expect their Japanese allies, if they had entered into occupation of New-chwang, to withdraw if they considered it necessary to continue in occupation from a military point of view. He did not desire the Government to take any hostile action towards the Japanese or to put any pressure upon them which they had not put on the Russians during their occupation for the last four years. If the Japanese remained in occupation till the end of the present war he was certain that they would unhesitatingly hand back New-chwang to the Chinese military and civil jurisdiction as soon as the exigencies of the military situation would admit of it.

The present Government professed to be extremely anxious to promote British commercial interests. At present Russia, France, Belgium, Germany, and the United States were busily engaged laying down railways in China, using materials made in their own countries. This was a great iron and steel manufacturing country, but though we fought for the "open door" in China our iron and steel manufacturers and railway stock makers were having no part or share in the great business done with China in these goods. They were told that they had received concessions for 2,800 miles of railway in China, but the concessions seemed to have got into the hands of syndicates in this country who were not properly fulfilling the agreements made with the Chinese Government. He asked the Under-Secretary to say which, if any, of these projects were being actively taken in hand, whether there was any danger of concessions lapsing, and whether the reversion of them might not be secured for the British investing public and more enterprising persons than the present *concessionnaires.* He desired to know whether the commercial treaty with China came into operation on 1st January last, and whether the new treaty ports had been opened. He desired also to know whether His Majesty's Government had secured for the benefit of British commerce those further advantages that were got in the American and Japanese treaties which were subsequently concluded. Had the new rules with reference to the navigation of Chinese waterways come into force? These were practical questions affecting British trade in China, and he wanted the Government to take practical steps through the Foreign Office and otherwise to secure the carrying out of the provisions of any commercial treaty that would tend to promote the volume of British trade with the Chinese Empire. Referring to the Anglo-French Agreement, he asked whether the Government had succeeded in making arrangements by which British and French trade should enjoy equality of treatment not only in Siam and the adjacent territories, but also in South-West China. He hoped the Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs would be able to give the House a reassuring reply in regard to this matter.

Major Seely (Isle of Wight) asked whether the right hon. Gentleman could elucidate the reply which he had made shortly before to an hon. Member on the other side. He did not understand exactly what the right hon. Gentleman meant when he said the money was not to be paid by the British Government. In the document which had been presented to Members that day it was plainly stated that the expenses of the emigration agencies were to be borne by the British Government. The words were—

> "The British Consular Officer at the port or his delegate shall confer with the Chinese inspector as to the location and installation of the office and other necessary buildings hereinafter called the emigration agency, which shall be erected or fitted up by the British Government and at their expense."

The reply might be made that in point of fact the Transvaal Government or the mine managers would repay the money, but he thought the House must be chary of presuming that such repayment would be forthcoming, in view of the present economic condition of the Transvaal. In accordance with this document the British people would pay in the first instance, and probably in the long run. The result would be that the people of this country would be called upon to pay for an undertaking to which they were bitterly opposed. In his own constituency, at any rate, there was hardly one man who did not agree with him in resenting this proposal.

*MR. LYTTELTON said that this question was really of a very elementary character. He was surprised that the hon. Member for Poplar, who had so much experience as to treaties, had not seen that when one Power entered into a treaty with another it made certain engagements, and as between ourselves and China the British Government had become responsible for the erection of the buildings in which, for purposes of sanitation, it was necessary that the Chinamen should for a time be gathered. In carrying out that intention the hon. Member surely must be familiar with the fact that it was invariable in such instruments to mention only the liability of the contracting parties. Where we were going to find the money to discharge that liability was immaterial. To have put it on the face of the treaty with China would have been irregular and out of the usual form. His hon. and gallant friend made a point by saying that the Transvaal would be unable to pay the very small expense necessary to put up these buildings. If his hon. and gallant friend had waited until to-day, or if he had consulted the Ordinance in its earlier form, he would have found that the mine-owners had to pay very considerable fees for the issue of their licences, that considerable fees had to be paid by the owners of the ships that conducted the immigration, and thus a fund of considerable size was set up which would reimburse the Transvaal. If that fund was not sufficient the Transvaal Government would have to make good the expenditure.

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL (Oldham) asked whether there would be a Vote in the House if the Government had made] themselves responsible for the Transvaal?

*MR. LYTTELTON said there would be no Vote unless the money was required, and he did not anticipate that it would be required by the British Government. If a report was made by the Transvaal Government that there was not sufficient money, then they could come on the British Exchequer, and in that case, if it was necessary for them to do so, a Vote would be asked for.

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL said he understood that the buildings were going to be erected out of funds which would be supplied from British sources before the Chinese immigration began. He wished to ask whether the right hon. Gentleman was entitled to make the British Government responsible without asking for a Vote.

*MR. LYTTELTON said his hon. friend was not correct in saying that the money would be supplied by the British Government. The money would be supplied by the Transvaal Government, and the Transvaal Government would look to the mine-owners, who he thought even the hon. Member would admit had sufficient resources to meet such a trifling expenditure. It was necessary that an instrument should be drawn up between ourselves and the Chinese Government, and any one who had had experience in the drafting of treaties would acknowledge that if an obligation under a treaty was taken over by a Government subordinate to one of the contracting Governments, that did not diminish its force. As to the question of the hon. Member for Poplar as to when the regulations would be laid, if he had been present yesterday he would have heard him state that he expected that the Ordinance, the regulations, the form of contract, and the Convention, all placed conveniently in one Blue-book, would be in the hands of hon. Members to-day, and he believed that would be so. He regretted the hon. Member, without any knowledge of the facts, should have thought it necessary to say that he had broken a pledge. The hon. Member was out of order in referring to the question at all.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON said that what he had ventured to point out was that the right hon. Gentleman had stated specifically that the minimum wage would be 2s., and in an answer he gave two days ago he stated that the wages were to be from 1s. 6d. to 2s. a day.

*Mr. LYTTELTON said that what he stated was that the wages to be received by the Chinaman would be at least 2s. a day, and that statement was made from information received from the highest experts, who said that, in their opinion, the Chinaman would not go to the Transvaal for less. That information had, however, been proved to be incorrect, for, as a matter of fact, Chinamen were willing to go for a very much less sum.

Mr. JOSEPH WALTON said that Chinamen earned 2s. a day in the coal mines in the North of China.

*Mr. LYTTELTON said that the object he had at heart, and it was the object that every one would have at heart, was that this introduction of Chinese labour into the Transvaal should not operate to cut Kaffir wages. The object was to supplement Kaffir labour, and not to compete with Kaffir wages. That was the object he had in view and which he had pressed on Lord Milner, and hon. Members would see in the Blue-book that he insisted on that with perfect clearness. That end had been attained, and every single Chinaman would be able to earn more than the minimum wage of the Kaffir.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON said he clearly understood the right hon. Gentleman's explanation, but he was entitled to point out that in a speech made on 31st March the right hon. Gentleman said that the Chinaman would receive in the Transvaal 2s. a day, and later on he said that he had been advised that it was unnecessary and undesirable to specify in the Ordinance a minimum wage, but that he gave the House his assurance that the Chinaman would receive the amount he had specified. He thought in the circumstances the right hon. Gentleman would hardly say that he had done him an injustice.

*Mr. LYTTELTON said the point was the minimum wage. All anybody could fairly demand was that the minimum wage of the Chinaman should not be less than that of the Kaffir. In the course of a very few months it would be found that the Chinaman would be able to earn more than the minimum wage, and that the aggregate wages of a number of Chinamen would be greater than the aggregate wages of the same number of Kaffirs.

Mr. J. A. PEASE (Essex, Saffron Walden) asked the Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs for some information as to the progress of affairs in Macedonia. He knew that there was a blocking Motion on the Paper put down by the hon. Member for the Hanover Square Division, but the noble Lord might be able to give some information as to what was being done in regard to the gendarmerie and as regards the Consuls to be appointed in Macedonia.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs) said he would not like to go away from this question of Chinese labour. No one would, of course, charge the right hon. Gentleman the Colonial Secretary with deliberately breaking faith with the House. The right hon. Gentleman had throughout this South African business trusted to what he called "gentlemen of experience," and they misled him as they had misled his predecessors. He believed the advice of experts was the cause of the whole South African trouble from beginning to end. It was a great misfortune that the right hon. Gentleman could not work out this matter for himself and exercise his independent judgment without trusting so much to officials and "gentlemen of experience" in South Africa. All they knew at the present moment was that the British Government was, by the Ordinance circulated that day, undertaking financial responsibility for the recruiting of Chinese labour for South Africa. It was no business of the British Government to undertake the responsibility of recruiting Chinese labour for any part of the world. It was all very well to say the Transvaal would repay the expenses, but the Transvaal Government had already undertaken obligations they were unable to discharge. They were unable even to undertake that elementary duty of a civilised Government—that of keeping up a police force for the maintenance of law and order. How, then, could they take up a responsibility outside their ordinary functions? If these gentlemen wanted cheap labour, let them find it. The British Government did not undertake that duty for any other part of the Empire. The low-grade mines of Merionethshire could be worked at a profit with cheap labour at a shilling a day.

*MR. LYTTELTON said that under the terms of a treaty regulations had to be drawn up in respect to all Chinese subjects taking service in British dominions.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he quite appreciated the point of view of the Chinese Government and their natural desire to have financial arrangements endorsed by the British Government, but that was no reason for the latter undertaking the business. The Chinese Government would evidently not trust those gentlemen; and were not prepared to enter into any undertaking of magnitude with them. They wanted the endorsement of the British Government; but that was no reason why this country should give it. This was a business which the Transvaal should undertake for itself, especially as it was to be regarded as a self-governing colony. Why should this country undertake financial responsibilities and engagements which were not to be extended to other parts of the Empire. He desired to add his protest against the practice of putting down blocking notices. The Government were in a rickety condition; it was but a ramshackle concern, and the Government held Carlyle's view that rotten institutions will hold together so long as they were not roughly handled. So they laid down mines at the entrance of the harbour. From all points of view it would be wiser to allow discussion. But blocking notices prevented discussion upon all subjects in which the country had an interest. There was the Motion of the previous night in suspense. The Amendment of the Member for West Birmingham was not allowed to be discussed; it was treated as a pirate omnibus, and taken off the road because the driver was mistrusted, and passengers would not enter, fearing that, though labelled Sheffield, its destination was Birmingham. They could scarcely sail through the mines which had been laid down. Already his hon. friend the Member for Flint Boroughs had been blown up over the Tibet question; and one or two of their other cruisers had also been sunk. The Order Paper was littered with blocking Motions; and when the Ministerialists were in Opposition they would then have no complaint to make if similar tactics were adopted. They knew very well what the position of the hon. Member for Peckham was. He was a member of His Majesty's Government; he was the official blocker for the Government; he was one of its most important members, and did his duties so well that it was almost impossible to break through his lines. He was, however, perfectly certain that all those blocking Motions were put down by the Government. Then there was the hon. Member for Rotherhithe, who was also above suspicion. In fact, every hon. Member who was above suspicion had been brought into requisition; and every question that demanded discussion was blocked. That amounted to a public scandal; and the House of Commons ought to take serious notice of it in the interests of its own dignity and efficiency. The Prime Minister had only to say the word to stop this practice; but at present he appeared to be conniving at it. That was neither fair to the House of Commons nor to the country. Take the fiscal question——

MR. J. F. HOPE (Sheffield, Brightside) said that the Motion on the Paper with reference to the fiscal question was in the name of the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said that the difference was that the noble Lord believed in his Resolution. The noble Lord was pressing the Government; but he should like to see the hon. and learned Member for Peckham pressing the Government. The department of his hon. friend was to save the Government during the dinner hour—a duty which he discharged with very great credit.

Seriously, the House of Commons ought to be allowed to discuss the fiscal question. At present the Government would not face a vote of confidence. The Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham was still on the Paper.

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Gentleman is now proceeding to discuss the merits of a Motion which, he admits, is on the Paper.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he could not discuss the merits of the question because it had none. The point he wished to put was, that as there was nothing more important on the Order-book the Government ought to find time in which to discuss the Motion. They were told that the trade of the Empire was going to pieces.

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Gentleman is entitled to ask the Government for a day to discuss the Motion to which he refers; but he is not in order in discussing the Motion now.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he did not care from what point of view the matter was discussed; but it was of enormous importance. It had reference to the policy the Government had laid down for the future, and, so far as he could see, the only reason why it should not be discussed was that the Government feared their policy would not bear discussion. The whole difficulty had been creatd by a very disgraceful attempt to misuse the Rules of the House. In the interests of hon. Gentlemen opposite, seeing that some of them might return on the Opposition side, supporters of the present Government should join in the endeavour to obtain free discussion. He urged that it was impossible for the House to conduct its business under the present system. The Government was really trifling with the House and playing with the interests of the country. The sooner hon. Members took the subject into their own control the better it would be for the reputation of Parliament.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): said the question he desired to call attention to was the manner in which Trinity College and some of the Irish landlords were obstructing the working of the Irish Land Act. When the Irish Land Bill was passed through the House a sum of £5,000 per annum was voted for Trinity College for the purpose of making up the difference between the amount which would be received for the annual rents, and that which would be derived from the investments of the purchase money. So far as Trinity College was concerned as a direct landlord he had no desire to interfere with any bargains they made with their tenants, but Parliament had gone out of its way to give them the £5,000 a year in order that they should not lose by the sale of their head-rents They were great landowners and owners of superior interests in many parts of Ireland, and wherever they, as the owners of a head rent or a superior interest, had been compelled to fix the price of that superior interest, they had never gone below 27½ years purchase. Before the Act was passed the average price of these head rents was twenty-five years purchase. By this Act they had stopped the sale of any of their estates in the country. The Chief Secretary had said that he had no right to interfere, because, if the tenants were not satisfied with the price of the head-rents, they could have it arbitrated upon by the Land Commission or the Land Judge. There had been one arbitration, and one only, and he should like to ask the Chief Secretary, when this arbitration was before Mr. Justice Meredith was one word said about this £5,000, was one word said about this Parliamentary grant being made to ease the situation, and to enable the tenants to pay a reasonable rent? The House had done for Trinity College what it did for no other landlords. Was this money to accumulate in the hands of the trustees and not to benefit the tenants? Some day the House would be asked to give £50,000 or £60,000 for some purpose absolutely unconnected with land purchase. Trinity College authorities were endeavouring to get this money for some other purpose. It was time for Trinity College to recognise that all the Irish Members representing all Parties would be driven to work, and work resolutely, for the repeal of that section of the Land Act which gave this £5,000, because the tenants got nothing from it.

Mr. BOLAND (Kerry, S.) said the question raised by the hon. Member for South Tyrone was extremely important. In his own constituency they had a number of Trinity College tenants who had been precluded from purchasing owing to the exorbitant demands of Trinity College. He sincerely hoped the Chief Secretary would take warning from what had been said and that he would endeavour to make Trinity College part with their lands to their tenants. It was a monstrous thing that a corporation like this should be given greater facilities than any other landowner and should refuse to part with its land. He also desired to call attention to the action of the Congested Districts Board which, after a delay of two-and-a-half years, had provided only a temporary landingstage at Cooscroum, county Kerry, to enable the fishermen there to haul their boats up above high-water mark. It was scandalous that the Congested Districts Board should come down and attempt to settle this claim for a permanent landing stage in this way. The district would not accept a temporary landing stage put up at a cost of £10 as a settlement of their claim.

Mr. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.) congratulated the hon. Member for South Tyrone in drawing attention to the action of Trinity College. Under all the preceding Land Acts the average price of land in the county of Kerry had been fifteen years purchase, and the highest price paid since 1886 was eighteen years purchase. He wanted to know what had occurred since the passing of this Act that had caused land to increase in value to such an extent as to raise the price to twenty-seven years purchase. He suggested that a Committee should be appointed to inquire into the position of the middlemen as against Trinity College. He had no interest in the middlemen. He had always regarded them as the curse of Ireland. But here was where the injustice came in. The middleman's rent had been fixed since 1851, and in a case with which he was familiar the amount received by the middleman from his tenants had been reduced within the last thirty years by 40 per cent.; but he still had to pay the exorbitant rent originally fixed by Trinity College. If it was fair that the tenants' rents should be reduced according to the fall in the price of agricultural produce, surely it was equally fair that the rent paid to Trinity College by the middlemen should be proportionately reduced. His one desire was to see the Land Act work smoothly in every county in Ireland, but nineteen out of every twenty landlords were not giving it a fair opportunity. The right hon. Gentleman failed to carry out the recommendations of the Land Conference in their entirety, and, as a consequence, the landlords were pocketing the whole benefit of the decadal reductions which ought to go to the tenants, with the result that prices had risen from seventeen to twenty-two or twenty-three years purchase The position of agriculture had not improved; labour was more expensive; and if the Land Act was going to work out at twenty-five or twenty-six years purchase the British Treasury, before ten years had passed, would be looking in vain to Irish farmers for the repayment of annuities based on impossible purchase prices.

The CHIEF SECRETARY for IRELAND (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) said he did not propose to embark on the wider issues raised by the hon. Member for North Kerry. He thought the hon. Member was under a complete misapprehension as to the way in which the Land Act was working. He spoke of twenty-five and twenty-six years purchase on the first and second-term rents, but he (the Chief Secretary) had no evidence that any such prices had been agreed to.

Mr. FLAVIN: The right hon. Gentleman himself has spoken of twenty-seven years purchase as being the average, I pointed out that Trinity College had asked for twenty-seven years purchase.

Mr. WYNDHAM said he knew that the hon. Member had views about average prices which he did not share, but he could hardly expect him to repeat then what he said more than once last year with regard to the Land Conference. It was true the Government did not see their way to give all that was asked, either by the landlords or by the tenants, so a balance was struck and on the whole the Act was working as well as could be expected in an imperfect world. At the beginning of negotiations he found it was usual for the landlord to ask more and for the tenant to offer less than they were willing generally to agree to. He occasionally received alarming accounts of a total deadlock on some estates; ten days afterwards he was told he need not trouble so much about them, and a fortnight later he heard that an amicable agreement had been arrived at. This had happened so often within the last three months that he ventured to hope it might be the normal results of the Act passed last year. With regard to the narrower question of the Trinity College head-rents, it should be remembered that a head-rent was almost as distinct as it could be from an agricultural rent fixed by a Court and subject to alteration—generally reduction—at the end of fifteen years. Therefore, as it was of a permanent character and not subject to alteration, it was of greater value than any agricultural rent, and certainly worth a larger number of years purchase than a rent liable to reduction by a Court.

MR. KILBRIDE (Kildare, S.) asked whether a head rent was more sacred than a tithe rent-charge.

MR. WYNDHAM said he was not sufficiently a lawyer to answer that question, but he would say that a head-rent was of greater value, because tithes could be reduced and had been commuted, but Parliament had never intervened with regard to head-rents. If it was held to be reasonable that in respect of agricultural rents subject to reduction by the Courts, such an amount of money should be given as when invested would give to the owner an income comparable with the net income which he previously received, clearly a higher price ought to be given for a head-rent. He thought that an owner might legitimately expect to receive for a head-rent such a sum as when invested in first-class securities would give him his income without any reduction, or something very near it. He believed that was the attitude taken up by the owners of head-rents. On that basis, if the money were invested at 3¼ per cent., an owner would require thirty years purchase to bring him in the income he had previously received.

It was for that reason that he asked the House to pay £5,000 a year to Trinity College to be used only in the case of their income from head-rents being reduced by sales under the Act. Taking the investment at 3¼ per cent., their £5,000 a year would be required if twenty-seven and a half years purchase was asked instead of thirty years. In a test case before Mr. Justice Meredith brought by Trinity College, the twenty-seven and a half years was reduced to twenty-six. In some cases it might be more and in others less, but that did not seem to be an unsatisfactory conclusion. A rigid rule could not be laid down for all cases, and he deprecated any attempt on the part of Parliament to say that these head-rents should always obtain a given number of years purchase. The position of Trinity College was apart from that of any private individual. It was a public institution giving University education, and no Government would consent to imperil the work of such a body by the operation of another Act which might incidentally cut down their annual income by one-fourth or one-fifth. To deal with the problem he accepted the suggestion which was made at the time, that a Commission should be appointed to look into the whole question, and he had now made up his mind as to the terms of reference. They were the following:—"To inquire into and report upon the relations subsisting between the grantees and lessees and the occupying tenants since the date of the passing of the College Leases in Perpetuity Act, 1851, and to inquire into and report upon the means by which the purchase by the occupying tenants of their holdings under the provisions of the Land Act may be facilitated without diminishing the average net rental derived by Trinity College as the head landlord." He would take into account what the hon. Member had said with regard to the congested districts, but he would remind the hon. Member that the funds of the congested districts Board were not unlimited, and they had to be devoted to the definite objects of that Board and could not be diverted to such works as he had mentioned, however desirable they might be.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR (Liverpool, Scotland) said this was a question of very great importance. He did not know whether he was right or not, but this struck him as being a further demand for subsidising Trinity College. That to his mind was what appeared to lie behind the words of the right hon. Gentleman. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would not proceed with the inquiry until he had given hon. Members from Ireland an opportunity of expressing their views upon the subject, and Irish Members could not be expected at that moment to express an opinion upon the terms of reference just read out by the right hon. Gentleman; but he must say that he was not altogether attracted by some of the words contained in it. They struck him, as far as he could judge from hearing them read rapidly, as intended to be a preliminary to a further demand for subsidising Trinity College. As to the present position and prospects of the Land Act, he regretted to say that he could not form quite as sanguine a view of its working as the right hon. Gentleman formed. He had made inquiries in Ireland, and there was not only a feeling of uneasiness, but a good deal of indignation upon this subject. He thought the hon. Member for South Tyrone would bear him out upon this point. The temper of the Convention held in Dublin was very strong indeed as to the manner in which the landlords had been conducting negotiations with regard to the sale of their estates. There appeared to be an effort to produce something like a land boom which was altogether unjustified in the present circumstances. He had not yet been able to understand the process of reasoning upon which the landlords proceeded to add several years purchase to the ordinary normal number of years purchase. He knew the right hon. Gentleman did not like land purchase to be tested by the number of years purchase, but this was the only current coin of exchange which the Irish people understood and it was the only test by which they would try all these purchases.

With regard to Trinity College, he spoke strongly upon the proposal of the right hon. Gentleman, when it was carried last year, by which that College received a special bonus of its own upon these transactions. The right hon. Gentleman succeeded in carrying the bonus of £5,000 for Trinity College, and what was the argument by which he succeeded in persuading the House to accept that extraordinary proposition? Trinity College was not the only educational institution which had suffered from the depreciation in land values. If the Chief Secretary for Ireland went down to Oxford or Cambridge he would find colleges in those districts which had been crippled on account of the fall in the price of agricultural produce. No one had ever proposed that colleges at Oxford or Cambridge, or even Guy's Hospital, should be recompensed by the State by granting an annual subsidy on account of a reduction in revenue through the fall in agricultural prices. He thought they had a right to go back upon the reason which was given to justify that bonus which was to facilitate the sale of holdings by Trinity College to their tenants. Had that been justified? He had never used the language of violent vituperation because the landlords were attempting to drive hard bargains, for that was human nature, but he thought the landlords were now pushing things so far that they were preparing for themselves a day of reckoning in which they would not get anything like the prices they were asking. It might be said that the case of Trinity College was different, and that it was not in the same position as other institutions. What had been the action of Trinity College, Dublin? They got the £5,000 bonus, and by the same extraordinary process of reasoning which appeared to have animated the landlords, they concluded that because they had got this advantage they should refuse to accept the prices which they were ready to take before they had received that advantage. The Chief Secretary appeared to pass by altogether the concrete fact that Trinity College was demanding twenty-seven and a half years purchase after having got this bonus of £5,000, whilst before they got that bonus they were willing to accept twenty years purchase. That was the return that Trinity College was giving to the right hon. Gentleman for the £5,000 which Parliament so unwillingly consented to grant to Trinity College.

Mr. HEMPHILL (Tyrone, N.) said the terms of reference seemed to imply that under no circumstances should Trinity College suffer any loss as head landlord. He thought the reference ought to be modified so as to leave it open to the Commissioners to say whether under certain circumstances Trinity College, like other head landlords, might not have to undergo certain loss. All who had any experience in Ireland knew that a great number of head landlords had had to undergo serious loss under the operation of the Land Purchase Acts, and he could see no reason why Trinity College should be put on a different footing from others. Trinity College had many advantages which individual landlords could not possibly have, because it was not dependent on its rents. It had a large income derived from the fees of pupils, and the fees of those who took degrees. Why, therefore, should Trinity College be placed in such a position that, no matter how other landlords might suffer by the operation of the Land Purchase Acts, which were passed on principles of great public policy, it should not suffer in the same proportion as others? Trinity College sent two Members to Parliament who were always supporters of the Conservative Government no matter how extreme the views of that Government might be, but why, in regard to the land it possessed, that particular corporation should be favoured above all other corporations or individuals no one could possibly understand. Why should not Trinity College run a certain amount of risk in this matter? He believed it was the richest corporation in the Empire, and he understood that the individual members of the corporation were paid on a larger scale than almost any other class of the community. It should not be allowed to stand in the way of carrying out the great policy of converting the occupiers of Ireland into freeholders by demanding an unreasonable price. Trinity College should be subject to the same contingencies attending the occupation of land as other landlords, and they were not entitled to statutory immunity from these contingencies for all time. He should object to a reference involving a declaration *per fas et nefas* that Trinity College should always be secured for its net income beyond any possibility of change.

Mr. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.) said he concurred with the hon. Member for the Scotland Division that in the absence of the hon. Member for Waterford it might be desirable not to refer to the question.

Mr. SHACKLETON (Lancashire, Clitheroe) said the Shop Hours Bill had not yet been presented to the House. This Bill was deeply interesting to the people whom it would affect.

*Mr. SPEAKER: The Bill has been presented and printed.

Mr. SHACKLETON said he was not aware that it had been issued. He wished to ask the Home Secretary whether they might hope that it would be pressed forward so that considerable hardship might be removed in the case of those who were subjected to unreasonable treatment in the matter of hours. Seven years ago an Act was passed dealing with the question of compensation to workmen, and it had not been in operation for more than two years before it was found to contain a considerable number of anomalies. When the King's Speech was published workmen throughout the country were pleased to find mention of a Bill dealing with the subject, believing that it would give relief from some of the anomalies of the present Act. They desired that this Bill should be introduced, and that a serious attempt should be made to grapple with the defects of the law as it now stood. He could give many illustrations of the hardships suffered by workmen at present, but he would only give one arising out of a case which occurred recently in his own society. Before the present Act was passed they were told that it was intended to provide in cases of accident for the payment of half wages with a limit of £1 per week, but it was found when the Act came into operation that it was not half wages as they understood the term. In the case to which he desired to call attention a workman was obliged to stay at home to attend to his sick wife. After returning to work he had an accident by which he lost the sight of one eye. During these three months the return of wages was used against him to reduce his claim under the Act, and instead of receiving half wages, he only received 7s. 6d. a week. That was a case which had arisen on account of a decision of the Judges. There were other cases, such as casual employment.

*Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is not in order in suggesting an amendment of the law.

Mr. SHACKLETON said he would not pursue that line of argument. He maintained, however, that working men were waiting anxiously for the Government to do something in regard to this matter; and they would carefully watch the intentions of the Government.

Mr. STEVENSON (Suffolk, Eye) said he did not know whether it would be competent for the Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs to make any statement in regard to Macedonia in view of the fact that there was a Motion on the Paper; but he hoped it would be possible for him to make a statement in regard to the position of affairs in Asiatic Turkey, especially among the Armenian villages in the plain of Mush. There had been many serious instances of provocative agents in that region starting hostilities so as to bring the Kurds to commit outrages on the inhabitants. The Government had a heavy responsibility in this matter of Armenia, because, under the Sixty-first Article of the Treaty of Berlin it was declared that there should be security for the life and property of the inhabitants in that distracted region. He earnestly trusted that the Government would make every conceivable effort to prevent the peace of that part of the world being disturbed. Unfortunately, there was still going on there the same extortion by the tax-gatherers which existed years ago, and the same employment of irregular troops. Armenia was in a chronic state of unrest on account of the mis-government; and it was to be hoped that the Government would, through its agents, keep in touch with those regions. There were Kurds and Kurds, and it would be specially advisable that this country should be represented when the Commission consisting of the Vali of Bitlis and the Armenian bishops made their inquiry into the present condition of affairs in that quarter of Asia Minor.

*The UNDER-SECRETARY of STATE for FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Earl Percy, Kensington, S.) said he had been asked to make some statement as to the measures the Government had taken for the protection of British residents at New-chwang. That was a portion of China which both the belligerents had declined to recognise as included in the neutralised area. The Government withdrew the gunboat some time ago, because she would have been in great danger in the event of an attack upon that place; but they had now sent her to another port just west of Shan-hai-kwan, where she would be ready in the event of any emergency. The Government had received as late as 15th May an intimation from the British Consul at New-chwang that he did not apprehend any danger to the lives or property of residents there, that there were practically no brigands in the neighbourhood, and that the Russian civil administrator had undertaken to do all in his power to secure protection to life and property. As to the railway concessions in China, under the form of contract entered into with the Chinese Government, there was no danger of their lapsing; but he did not know that he regarded it as an entirely satisfactory fact that no step had been taken by the British China Corporation to commence work on the construction of these railways. He had already stated in a speech that he thought it was not fair to the Chinese Government, which had granted the concessions, to the British Government, which had applied for them, or to the British community in China that no advance should have been made towards putting China in possession of railway facilities; but the British China Corporation had assured the Government that in the present condition of the money market it was impossible to float the loans, and that was an eventuality provided for under the contract. As regarded the commercial treaties which had been signed with China by Japan and the United States, of course there was no necessity for the British Government to enter into negotiations with either of these countries for the right to share the concessions which were made, because we should obtain all those advantages under our most-favoured-nation clause in the Treaty of Tientsin.

As to the events in certain portions of the Kurdish districts in Armenia the Government had no very clear information from the locality as to what exactly had happened, but they heard from the British Ambassador at Constantinople some weeks ago that a fairly large force of Armenian revolutionaries had crossed from Russian and Persian territory as they had done in 1897 or 1898. The Sultan was anxious that the Armenian Patriarch at Constantinople should put himself in communication with the insurgents, and offer them, if they would give a pledge to return to the territories from which they had come, a complete amnesty. Since then the Government had received various reports as to the incidents that had occurred in the interior. One report was to the effect that the Armenian revolutionaries had attacked the Kurdish troops and killed many of them. The Kurds brought the dead bodies of their comrades into Mush and this naturally caused a great deal of excitement. Another report was to the effect that certain Turkish gendarmes went to an Armenian village to collect taxes which the Armenians alleged had already been paid, and that one of them on entering an Armenian house was immediately shot by the revolutionaries. The local Armenians admit that the first shot was fired by them. Sir Nicholas O'Conor did not entertain great hopes, in view of the impracticable attitude of the revolutionaries, of any fruitful result following from the intervention of the Armenian Patriarch or of his local representatives. The British Government had done all they could do. They had represented very strongly more than once to the Porte the necessity of taking every precaution in their power to prevent the employment of irregular troops or Kurds if they must suppress the revolutionary outbreak. They had also been in communication with the Russian and French Governments, with the result that they hoped to enlist the services of the Russian and French Consuls at Bitlis, as well as those of our own, to act as intermediaries to bring about a peaceful solution of the difficulty.

With regard to Macedonia, he had little to add to the statement which he made on the Motion for the Adjournment for the Easter holidays. The position of the European officers was, of course, anomalous, and he did not think that a precise definition of their powers was possible or advisable. They might say roughly that the task of these officers was the task of organisation, inspection, and control, as distinguished from the duty of actual command. But if they went further than that, and laid down a hard-and-fast rule as to what these European officers might or might not do in certain contingencies which could not possibly be foreseen, and which they hoped might never occur, they would tie the hands of these officers in dealing with any emergency that might arise. There was no sign whatever that any distrust or jealousy was entertained of the position of these officers by the local authorities. They had been greeted warmly on their arrival at Salonika by the Inspector-General, Hilmi Pasha. He had assured them that every facility would be placed at their disposal, and that the most prompt attention and respect would be paid to any recommendations which they might have to offer. General de Giorgis and his staff officers had already undertaken a visit of inspection to Monastir and Uskub, and all the foreign officers had proceeded to their respective spheres of influence. He understood that a beginning had been made in establishing the new school for the enlistment and training of the gendarmerie in Salonika, and therefore in the next few months they might be able to announce some practical and definite result of the scheme.

With regard to the two civil assessors, Lord Lansdowne had expressed in another place the great regret of the British Government that they were not in a position to say that any great progress had been made as the result of their appointment. They did not say that no progress had been made. On the contrary; their complaint was that the civil assessors had not furnished them with any report as to what they were doing which enabled them to say whether any progress had been made or not. They had asked the Russian and Austrian Governments for such reports, and the Russian Government had intimated their hope that in future they might be able to furnish us with information of that kind. The British Government thought they had a right to expect that these reports should be furnished, because the civil assessors, apart from their special responsibility to their respective Governments, also occupied a position of *quasi*-international responsibility to the Powers. There was no question of an international conference, because the British Government were pledged to give hearty and loyal support both in word and in deed to the Austrian and Russian reform scheme until that scheme had had a full and fair trial.

MR. ALFRED DAVIES (Carmarthen Boroughs) said he could not understand why blocking Motions should be introduced; but he hoped to be able to make a few remarks without falling foul of the Chair. As hon. Members were undoubtedly backward in their work he would suggest that the adjournment should be only until Tuesday next. The sky was clouded. There was trouble in Tibet; and this country was interested in the great fight that was now proceeding between Japan and Russia. If the Eastern nation won the consequences might be very serious, and he wished to know what action, if any, the Government were taking to bring about peace. There was trouble also in other parts of the world; and they ought to have a clear statement as to how the country stood. Then there was the education problem and the Licensing Bill. As regarded the latter, the consequences might undoubtedly be serious for the Government. The special question, however, to which he wished to refer was that of passive resistance. It was a very important question, and the House should bear in mind that 21,000 persons were now passive resisters. They included a number of men of influence, one Judge, many Justices of the Peace, and also many ministers of religion, Nonconformist and Conformist. Did the House imagine that those men were playing with the question? They resisted because they felt it was wrong to pay money for schools over which there was no public control. If there was public scontrol over all chools the difficulty would be avoided. Why should Nonconformists pay for schools in which they were not concerned? Why should not every man pay his own expenses to Heaven? He hoped that when the House resumed, legislation for the welfare of the people would be undertaken.

Mr. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.) said he wished to express his regret that the House was precluded from discussing subjects in which a deep interest was felt. It was humiliating to be condemned to see matters of the importance of which they were fully convinced withdrawn from the cognisance of the House on this occasion, and the humiliation was not less when it was remembered that the other House was subject to no such disability, and that there discussions could be freely raised upon Chinese labour, Tibet, Macedonia, or other matters of public interest. The disability under which they suffered was due to no Rule of the House, but to decisions of former Speakers, given without foreseeing the extent to which their rulings would compel their successors to go. And for that reason the House ought to address itself to recovering its own liberties. He could not but regret that the Government did not recognise the responsibility that rested upon them not to allow their supporters to put the House in such a humiliating position as to prevent the House, by means of these Motions, from discussing questions in which the country was deeply concerned. The Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs had made a statement in regard to events in Armenia which, in his recollection, did not seem to be accurate. He did not remember any occasion before the great massacres of 1894-5 when any large body of revolutionists marched in from Russian Armenia, and the accounts which he had read were entirely different from those which had reached the Under-Secretary. The accounts he had received, which had been confirmed by telegrams in *The Times*, were quite different. All these troubles arose from outrages committed by the Kurds, who descended upon the peasantry of the low country, the local officials conniving at the robberies committed. Having sent the Kurds off to do as much mischief as they could, they turned to account the incident by organising expeditions against the Christian population, murdering them, and burning their villages, and trumped-up this story of revolutionary movements in the attempt to justify themselves. At Constantinople, as any one who had taken the trouble to follow the course of events would see, the whole of the troubles were due to the action of Kurds and Turkish officials, and, if the Turkish Government had the goodwill, they would keep the Kurds in order and remove those offending, ill-intentioned, and ill-omened officials. He expressed a hope that the Government would endeavour to obtain fuller and clearer information than they had been able to give the House, and use all their influence in conjunction with other Powers to avert further disturbances by effecting the removal of the Kurdish Governor and the employment of regular troops instead of Kurds. He was glad to know that France would co-operate with that object, and the co-operation of Russia would be doubly valuable. In regard to the state of things in Macedonia, he noticed that in the other House a few days ago the Foreign Secretary stated that a difference had arisen between the Turkish Government and the Civil Agents of Austria and Russia, who had not been allowed to perambulate the country for the purpose of making their report.

*EARL PERCY said a telegram had been sent asking for the exact facts. Personally he thought it probable that the Turkish Government did not feel able to guarantee the safety of the Civil Agents unless a Turkish official accompanied them.

MR. BRYCE said he would not follow the noble Lord in what he had said about the gendarmerie, for under the ruling from the Chair he could not say more. The words used in the House of Lords by the Foreign Secretary had raised grave apprehensions, and he hoped the Government would use their utmost efforts to accelerate the progress of reforms and give to the people of Macedonia assurance of European sympathy and assistance.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's), replying to questions asked during the discussion, said the Shop Hours Bill had been carefully prepared, and he hoped to introduce it shortly after the House reassembled. It was not a new subject, and he did not anticipate there would be a long discussion on the Second Reading. The Workmen's Compensation Bill had been delayed by the necessity for inquiry into many technical matters by a Departmental Committee. The Report of that Committee would be presented in a few days, and when he had received it a Bill would be prepared, and he had every hope it might be carried through during the session as a non-contentious measure.

*MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty) called attention to the large proportion of deaths in the Highlands and Islands which were uncertified. His complaint was that although the Government were aware of this they treated the question with indifference. Few parochial medical officers in the Highlands held the Public Health diploma as required by statute, and though four years ago he was assured that the grievance would speedily be remedied, inasmuch as many young men were going in for the Public Health diplomas, matters had really gone from bad to worse. Nothing had been done in his constituency in the direction of establishing hospitals for the sick poor. The people died off like flies, and were buried without certificate, and without having been seen by a doctor. In some areas more than half the deaths were uncertified, and it was a scandal that this state of things should have been allowed to go on unattended to. It would cost a little money to put the matter on a sound footing, but it ought to be attended to without delay. The Highlands provided splendid men for the Army and the Naval Reserve, and were entitled to better treatment. If the Chinese only knew how this Government treated their own poor, he was convinced they would not be prepared to hand themselves over to the mining interest in South Africa. There were places in Scotland where there was not a doctor within forty miles. Arrangements ought to be made to provide more medical men in the various districts. He feared that some of the chief officials in the Local Government Board in Edinburgh did their work badly, and appeared to him to live too much at ease in Edinburgh. He had intended to raise other matters, but as he did not wish to detain hon. Members and officials on the eve of the holidays he would cut his remarks short.

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire) said that so far as the hon. Member's questions affected the Local Government Board, he could promise him that at a future period of the session he should have a nice quiet afternoon to deal with them. As to uncertified deaths, the hon. Member had complained that he got the same answer year after year. He could only give him the same answer again, and he was bound to say that he did not think there was the slightest grievance, or the slightest incentive to do anything which ought not to be done under the present system. To his mind it would be a perfectly useless expenditure to insist by law that every death should be certified by a doctor. There was no statutory duty cast upon any doctor whether in the Highlands or any other part of Scotland to certify. As the hon. Member knew, in cases of sudden death there was an inquiry by a public official, and in the whole of his experience he had never known of any crime going undetected because a death had not been certified.

MR. J. H. LEWIS (Flint Boroughs) said he wished to ask the Financial Secretary to the Treasury one question, and it was a very important matter. It related to the date at which the Committee stage of the Licensing Bill would be taken. He understood that it was not contemplated to take the Committee stage until Monday the 6th of June. He submitted to the Government that it would be an extremely improper thing to take the Committee stage at so early a date. The Bill was one of enormous importance, for it effected a revolutionary change in the system of licensing in this country. It would be quite easy for the Government to take the Finance Bill first, because it was by no means of such an important character as the Licensing Bill. The country required time to consider this measure, and he appealed to the Government to grant ample time for its consideration.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY (Sir A. ACLAND-HOOD, Somersetshire, Wellington) said of course his hon. friend could not expect him at a moment's notice to give a definite answer to his question, but he would certainly represent to the Prime Minister the views of the hon. Member and his friends, and when the House met again a definite answer would be given. Perhaps the Leader of the Opposition would ask a question when the House met, and then a definite date might be given.

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolved, That this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 31st May.—(*Sir A. Acland Hood.*)

Adjourned at twenty-five minutes after Seven o'clock till Tuesday, 31st May.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 31*st May*, 1904.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Croydon Gas Bill. Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Elysée Palace Hotel Company Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Govan Burgh (Electricity) Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment.

Liverpool and London and Globe Insurance Company Bill [Lords]; University of Leeds Bill [Lords]; Yorktown and Blackwater Gas Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Carlisle Corporation Bill. As amended, considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time.

London County Council (Tramways and Improvements) Bill. As amended, to be considered To-morrow.

Lytham Improvement Bill; Radcliffe Tramways and Improvement Bill. As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

Cardiff Railway Bill [Lords]; Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire Electric Power Bill [Lords]; Great Yarmouth Corporation Bill [Lords]; Leicestershire and Warwickshire Electric Power Bill [Lords]; Marylebone Chapels (Saint James, Westmoreland Street) Bill [Lords]; Minehead Urban District Council Water Bill [Lords]; West Riding Tramways Bill [Lords]. Read a second time, and committed.

Paisley District Tramways Order Confirmation Bill. Considered; to be read the third time upon Thursday.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 14) Bill. Read a second time, and committed.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Ardeonaig, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

ELECTRIC LIGHTING (LONDON) BILL.

Petition of the County of London and Brush Provincial Electric Lighting Company, Limited, against alteration (praying to be heard by Counsel): referred to the Select Committee on the Bill.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions against; from Paisley (three); Birmingham; Newcastle-on-Tyne; Washaway; Burnley; Thomas Parr and another; Evesham; Gosport (two); Maryhill; Marple (two); Torquay; East Dulwich; Burra Isle; Llandudno; Llanberis; Hirael (two); Bangor (four); Pwllheli (three); Griffin; Degarnog; Leamington Spa; Grange; Banchory (two); Dunoon; Camberwell Green; Conway (two); Coventry; Stonehaven; St. Ternan; Linacre (three); Hereford (six); East Parley; Rothesay; Carnarvon; Brixham; Bute; Llandudno Junction; Carlisle; Welburn; Lochbroom; Dingwall; Invergordon; Ullapool; Frant; Penibont; Staines; Bolton; Bulmer; Slingsby; Sheriff Hutton; Kingussie; Stratford (two); West Ham; Rishton; Batton; London (two); Redcar (four); Llanelly (three); City Road; Pembroke; Colne; Abbeygreen; Nelson; Glasgow (seven); South London; Wigton (two); Edgworth; Stone; Waverton; Tunstall; Paddington; Penrith; Burbank (two); St. Ives (Hunts); Harpenden; Easton; Wood Green; Bristol (two); Coppenhall; Sandbach; Dukinfield; East Bristol; Histon; Ashton-under-Lyne; Port Glasgow; Cullompton; Ilkley; Sparkhill; Kings Heath; Alva; Kinross; Kincardine; Alloa; Gartmorn; Westbury-on-Trym; Chelsea; Taunton (three); Chester-le-Street; Willaston; Newcastle-on-Tyne; Ullapool; Crewe; Lochee; Clackmannan; Radnor; and Battersea; to lie upon the Table.

PORT OF LONDON BILL.

Petition from Tottenham, against; to lie upon the Table.

SHOP HOURS BILL.

Petition from Glasgow, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

TUBERCULOSIS (ANIMALS) COMPENSATION BILL.

Petition of the London County Council, against (praying to be heard by Counsel); to lie upon the Table.

VALUATION BILL.

Petitions for alteration; from Dover; Pontefract; Narberth; Brackley; Stokesley; and Cardigan; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

The following Papers, presented by Command of His Majesty during the Whitsuntide Recess, were delivered to the Librarian of the House of Commons during the Recess, pursuant to the Standing Order of the 14th August, 1896:—

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copies of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3168 to 3174.

COLONIAL REPORTS (ANNUAL).

Copy of Colonial Report, No. 415 (Falkland Islands, Annual Report for 1903).

TRANSVAAL (MAGISTRATES).

Copy of Despatch from the Governor of the Transvaal enclosing a Return with regard to the Magistrates of the Colony.

FISHERY BOARD (SCOTLAND).

Copy of Twenty-second Annual Report of the Fishery Board for Scotland, being for the year 1903. Part II., Salmon Fisheries.

MINES AND QUARRIES.

Copy of Report to the Secretary of State for the Home Department by J. S. Haldane, Esq., M.D., F.R.S., J. S. Martin, Esq., His Majesty's Inspector of Mines, and R. A. Thomas, Esq., on the health of Cornish Miners.

MILITIA AND VOLUNTEERS (ROYAL COMMISSION).

Copy of Report of the Royal Commission on the Militia and Volunteers.

TUBERCULOSIS (HUMAN AND BOVINE) (ROYAL COMMISSION).

Copy of Interim Report of the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the relations of Human and Animal Tuberculosis.

IRISH LAND COMMISSION (PROCEEDINGS).

Copy of Return of Proceedings during the month of January, 1904.

DUBLIN METROPOLITAN POLICE.

Copy of Statistical Tables for the year 1903.

MARRIAGES, BIRTHS, AND DEATHS (IRELAND).

Copy of Supplement to the Thirty-seventh Report of the Registrar-General of Marriages, Births, and Deaths in Ireland, containing Decennial Summaries for the years 1891–1900.

Ordered, That the said Papers do lie upon the Table.

FEE FUND (HOUSE OF LORDS).

Account presented, of the Fee Fund of the House of Lords from 1st April, 1903, to 31st March, 1904 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

NATIONAL PORTRAIT GALLERY.

Copy presented, of Forty-seventh Annual Report of the Trustees of the National Portrait Gallery, 1903–4 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

SUPERANNUATION ACT, 1884.

Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 26th May, 1904, declaring that Thomas Tootell, Letter Carrier, Post Office, was appointed without a Civil Service Certificate through inadvertence on the part of the Head of his Department [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

UGANDA RAILWAY ACTS, 1896 AND 1902.

Account presented, showing the Money issued from the Consolidated Fund under the provisions of the Uganda Railway Acts, 1896 (59 and 60 Vic., c. 38), and

1902 (2 Edw. 7, c. 40), and of the Money expended and borrowed, and Securities created under the said Acts, to 31st March, 1903, together with the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General thereon [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 184.]

POST OFFICE (MONEY ORDERS).

Copy presented, of the Postal Order (Sierra Leone) Regulations, 1904, dated 18th May, 1904 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

BRITISH GUIANA ORDINANCE, 1891.

Return presented, relative thereto [Address 19th May; *Sir Henry Fowler*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 185.]

EAST INDIA (PROGRESS AND CONDITION).

Copy presented, of Statement exhibiting the Moral and Material Progress and Condition of India during the year 1902-3. Thirty-ninth Number [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 186.]

SOUTHERN RHODESIA.

Copy presented, of Correspondence relating to the proposed introduction of Indentured Asiatic (Chinese) Labour into Southern Rhodesia [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PRIVATE LEGISLATION PROCEDURE (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1899.

Copy presented, of Report by the Chairman of Committees of the House of Lords and the Chairman of Ways and Means in the House of Commons, under the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, that they are of opinion that the provisions of the Loch Leven Water Power Order, and of the Loch Leven Water Power (Extension of Time) Order are of such a character that they ought to be dealt with by Private Bills and not by Provisional Orders [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 187.]

FRANCE (No. 2, 1904).

Copy presented, of Notes exchanged between the Marquess of Lansdowne and the French Ambassador on Signature of the Convention and Declarations of 8th April, 1904 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, No. 3175 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

COUNTY COURTS (IRELAND) REGISTRARS (SALARIES, ETC.)

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 11th May: *Mr. Condon*]; to lie upon the Table.

BANKING AND RAILWAY STATISTICS (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Report on the Banking and Railway Statistics of Ireland for the half-year ended 31st December, 1903 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

DISEASES OF ANIMALS ACTS.

Copy presented, of Report of Proceedings by the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction for Ireland, under the Diseases of Animals Acts, for the year 1903 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

LABOURERS' COTTAGES (IRELAND).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 22nd March; *Mr. O'Shaughnessy*]; to lie upon the Table.

MERCANTILE MARINE (SIGHT TESTS).

Copy presented, of Report on the Sight Tests used in the Mercantile Marine for the year ended 31st December, 1903 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

STRIKES AND LOCK-OUTS.

Copy presented, of Report on the Strikes and Lock-outs of 1903, and on Conciliation and Arbitration Boards [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Lunatic Asylums.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE (Bristol, E.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he would grant a Return showing the total amount of indebtedness of counties and county boroughs for the erection and maintenance of lunatic asylums, and the cost per head of lunatics for buildings and maintenance.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) I think I shall be able to agree to a Return on this subject if the hon. Member will, before putting a Motion on the Paper, settle with me the form which it would be best for the Return to take.

Westminster Bridge Tramway Terminus.

CAPTAIN JESSEL (St. Pancras, S.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the Report from the Committee on Group 5 of Railway Bills, London County Council (Tramways and Improvements) Bill, in reference to the suggestion of the Home Office as regards the removal of the tramway terminus at Westminster Bridge; and whether, in view of the evidence given by the Chief Commissioner of Police as to the obstruction caused to traffic and the number of dangerous and fatal accidents, he proposes to take any action.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) I have seen the Report which has been made to the House by the Select Committee on this Bill; and I propose that the House shall be asked to deal with the point raised on the Report stage of the Bill.

Workmen's Compensation Amendment Bill—Date of Introduction.

MR. J. F. HOPE (Sheffield, Brightside): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is yet in a position to state when the Workmen's Compensation (Amendment) Bill will be introduced.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) The Departmental Committee, to whom was entrusted the task of examining the many important and complicated questions raised by any suggestion of extending and amending the existing Workmen's Compensation Acts, are pressing forward the consideration of their Report with all possible speed. When the Report is in my hands no time will be lost on my part; but I cannot fix a date for the introduction of the Bill.

Manufacture of Antitoxin Serum.

MR. CAMERON (Durham, Houghton-le-Spring): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the report of the Lister Institute of Preventive Medicine, in which it is admitted that the injection of antitoxin causes a large number of rashes, inflammation of joints (ascribed to something inherent in the serum of horses or other animals), and also an increased number of cases of paralysis; and whether, in view of this statement, he will consider the advisability of taking steps to prohibit the manufacture of serum in laboratories licensed under the Vivisection Acts.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) The manufacture of serum is a procedure outside the scope of the Cruelty to Animals Act; and I am not prepared to act on the suggestion of the hon. Member. As regards the first part of the Question, I presume the hon. Member refers to a pamphlet which the Lister Institute has thought it right to issue, by way of a warning (in order to prevent unnecessary alarm) that in some cases certain results, such as rashes and joint pains, may follow the therapeutic use of sera. These results, it is stated, are of a temporary nature and cause no bad after effects. The words of the pamphlet with reference to diptheritic paralysis do not convey to my mind the meaning attributed to them by the hon. Member.

Mail Steamship Subsidies—P. and O. Contract.

MR. H. C. RICHARDS (Finsbury, E.): To ask the Postmaster-General if he is about to renew the contract with the Peninsular and Oriental Steamship Company for another three years; and, if so, whether he will consider the Report and recommendations of the Committee appointed by this House as to mail steamship and other subsidies; and when he will afford to the House an opportunity of discussing the terms of the proposed extended contract and of cancelling or amending the same.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) I have arranged with the Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Company for a renewal of their contract for three years on terms given in my reply to a Question asked in this House on the 17th inst., to which I beg leave to refer the hon. Member.† The opinions given by the Committee on Steamship Subsidies, who expressly refrained from recommendations, have, of course, come under my notice; but the present question is merely one of extending an existing arrangement in all its details save speed and subsidy. Any variation of terms arising out of the opinions expressed by the Select Committee will fall to be dealt with under whatever contract may be made on the basis of tenders for which invitations are to be issued. An opportunity for discussion of the short extension now arranged will occur on Post Office Estimates.

Postal Gratuities for Those not Entitled to Pensions—Amount to be distributed in Ireland.

MAJOR JAMESON (Clare, W.): To ask the Postmaster-General how much of the £5,000 which he proposes to allocate amongst postal officials who are not entitled to pensions will be distributed in Ireland.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) This will depend on the number of deserving cases in Ireland which I have to deal with. The conditions applying to the grant of gratuities under this head are the same in all parts of the United Kingdom.

Sale of the Ballyrankin Estate, County Wexford.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that on the occasion of a pending negotiation for sale of the Ballyrankin (county Wexford) Estate of the Rev. Nicholas Jessop Devereux to his tenants, the landlord sold the interest of three of the tenants, namely, Ellen Cadd, Edward Leary, and Mary McDonald, to an adjoining tenant named James Fitzpatrick, instead of including them in the sale, thereby making Fitzpatrick a landlord over these people, and so enabling him to evict them without compensation, the former Mrs. Cadd having expended £200 on her premises; and whether, in view of the provisions of the Act of 1903, the sale of this estate will be sanctioned by the Land Commission if such a transaction be insisted on by the landlord and the tenant Fitzpatrick.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) An originating application in respect of the lands referred to has been lodged with the Estates Commissioners, who have declared them to be an estate for the purposes of the Act of 1903. No agreements for purchase by the tenants have yet been lodged. When this has been done and the report of their inspector has been received, the matters alluded to in the Question will receive the attention of the Commissioners. The inspectors have instructions to report as to any sub-tenancies that may exist upon the lands inspected.

Financial Statement of Malta.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, in view of the fact that no allowance for depreciation in public securities was made in the last financial statement furnished by the Chief Secretary of Malta, and that panic was created, followed by a run on the savings banks, he will state what action he proposes to take in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Lyttelton.*) The hon. Member is in error in supposing that no allowance was made for depreciation in public securities held by the Malta Government in the account to which he refers. That account contained a statement of reserve funds amounting respectively to £13,207 15s. 1d., and £10,710 5s. 1d., which are intended to cover any such possible losses. The run upon the savings bank, which was met without any difficulty whatever by the Government, was not due to the cause suggested by the hon. Member but to articles in the local Press deliberately calculated to have that effect. I see no reason for taking any action in the matter.

Press Offences in Malta.

MR. BOLAND: To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether any change has taken place within recent years in the Law of Malta as regards Press offences; whether the right of trial by jury has been abolished in such cases; if so, can he state the date on which such change was made; and how many cases of this nature have been tried since that date by a Judge without a jury.

---

† See page 35.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Lyttelton.*) The Law of Malta as regards Press offences is contained in Ordinance No. XIV. of 1889, and there has been no amendment in the Law since that date. Criminal actions under the Law in question have always been tried by a Judge and jury, and civil actions by a Judge without a jury.

Value of Commerce between Malta and Italy.

Mr. BOLAND: To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he can state the total value of the commerce between Malta and Italy for each of the last five years.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) According to the official Italian Trade Statistics, the value of the trade of Italy with Malta in each of the years from 1898 to 1902, inclusive, was as follows:

Years.	(Special Trade) Value of Imports into Italy from Malta.	(Special Trade) Value of Exports from Italy to Malta.
	£.	£.
1898 - -	54,000	391,000
1899 - -	46,000	419,000
1900 - -	55,000	440,000
1901 - -	45,000	453,000
1902 - -	39,000	459,000

The figures for 1903 are not yet available.

British Subjects in Egypt and the Soudan—Proportion of Maltese.

Mr. BOLAND: To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he can state the total number of British subjects in Egypt and the Soudan, and how many of these are Maltese.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Lyttelton.*) According to the census of 1897 there were then 14,654 British subjects in Egypt exclusive of the Army of Occupation. Of these 6,481 were Maltese. No census has ever been taken in the Soudan, but the total number of British subjects there must be very small.

Value of Goods supplied and Commission charged by the Crown Agents to Malta.

Mr. BOLAND: To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he can state the value of goods supplied to the Malta Government by the Crown Agents in England for each of the last five years, and what was the amount of commission charged in each year of that period; and can he state the amount expended by the Government of Malta on public works, during the same period, when the Crown Agents have not been employed.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Lyttelton.*) The value of goods supplied to the Government of Malta, and the commission, charged by the Crown Agents in each of the last five years, is as follows:—

	Stores supplied by Crown Agents.	Commission.
	£	£ s. d.
1899 - -	12,685	126 16 1
1900 - -	17,341	173 7 10
1901 - -	21,122	211 2 10
1902 - -	17,098	170 19 4
1903 - -	11,747	117 8 10

I regret that I am unable to understand the last half of the hon. Member's Question as the Crown Agents are not employed by the Government of Malta in the execution of any public works.

Changes in the Maltese Constitution.

Mr. BOLAND: To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he can state whether any, and if so what, change has been effected in the Maltese Constitution with reference to the election of members of the Council, subsequent to the date of the last document printed in the recently published Paper on political affairs in Malta; and can he give the text of such alteration.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Lyttelton.*) Clause 32 of the Letters Patent dated 3rd June, 1903, has been repealed by Letters Patent dated 15th April, 1904, and the following clause has been substituted in lieu thereof, viz :—"If any elected member of the Council shall, by writing under his hand addressed to the Governor, resign his seat in the Council, or shall be absent, except on the ground of illness, from the sittings of the Council for a period of two calendar months during the session of the Council without the leave of the Council, or shall for the period of one month be a party to any contract with the Government of Malta, for or on account of the public service, or shall become subject to any of the disqualifications specified in these Letters Patent, or shall take any oath or make any declaration of allegiance to any Foreign State or Power, his seat in the Council shall thereupon become vacant. Whenever the seat of an elected member has become vacant, the Governor shall, as soon as possible, issue a writ for the election of a new member in the place of the member whose seat has become vacant. Provided that, if an elected member shall, without the permission of the Council, within a year from the date of his election resign his seat in the Council either before or after taking the oath prescribed by Clause 33 of these Our Letters Patent, or shall, except on the ground of illness, be absent from the sittings of the Council for a period of two calendar months during the session of the Council without the like permission, it shall not be necessary for the Governor to issue a writ until after the expiration of twelve calendar months reckoned from the day on which the resignation in writing of such member shall be received by the Governor or from the day on which the said member shall have completed two calender months absence from the sittings of the Council as the case may be."

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

—

Chinese Labour in the Transvaal.

MR. WHITLEY (Halifax): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies what is the estimated cost of the offices and other necessary buildings, including the depôts, which are, under the agreement with the Chinese Government, to be erected and fitted up by the British Government for the purpose of carrying on the business of the engagement and shipment of Chinese coolies for the Transvaal gold mines; on what Vote will the money be charged; and will a Supplementary Estimate be introduced for the purpose.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. LYTTELTON, Warwick and Leamington): I am not in a position to state the estimated cost. The British Government is responsible to the Chinese Government under the Convention on behalf of the Transvaal or any other colonial Government which may desire to import indentured Chinese labourers; but the charges will be borne in each case by the colonial Government concerned; in this case by the Government of the Transvaal.

MR. WHITLEY: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether it will not be necessary under the Rules of the House that the cost shall appear on the Estimates and that any receipts from the Transvaal Goverment shall appear as Appropriations in aid.

MR. LYTTELTON: That is a question of some difficulty, but I think it is not the case.

MR. WHITLEY: Will the Union Jack fly over these depôts?

[No answer was returned.]

The Mission to Tibet.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he will give the latest information as to the position of the armed Mission to Tibet; whether he will state whether recent developments in connection with the advance of the

British force have made it necessary for the Government to change the views expressed and the instructions given in their telegram to the Viceroy, dated 6th November, 1903; whether any reinforcement of the British troops is contemplated; and whether he will give the approximate cost of the expedition up to 1st May last.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): Communications between Gyangtse and Kangma, which were interrupted on the 23rd May, owing to the insecure state of the roads, were resumed on the 28th May. The position of the Mission at Gyangtse is stated in the telegram from the Viceroy of yesterday, published in this morning's newspapers. (2) As I stated on the 12th inst.† in my announcement of the decision of His Majesty's Government as to negotiations at Lhasa, it is not intended to depart in any way from the policy laid down in the telegram of the 6th November last. (3) The Government of India has taken steps to send forward such reinforcements as it considers necessary for the safety of the Mission. (4) The total estimated cost of the Mission to the 31st March last is £308,500. The monthly cost is estimated at a little over £50,000 from April.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.): Can the right hon. Gentleman give any information as to the loss of life on the part of the enemy?

MR. BRODRICK: No, Sir. Any knowledge that we possess on that point has already appeared in the newspapers.

MR. LOUGH: That is not much.

The National Memorial to Lord Salisbury.

DR. FARQUHARSON (Aberdeenshire, W.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury what arrangements are to be made concerning the national memorial to Lord Salisbury; whether it is to be thrown open to competition; and who is to select the sculptor and decide on the site or the material of the statue.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I think it will probably be convenient to follow the last precedent set in matters of this kind, and not to throw the design open to general competition. The Government have accepted a site at the western end of the Abbey offered to them by the Dean and Chapter.

DR. FARQUHARSON: The right hon. Gentleman has not said who will select the sculptor.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am in communication with Lord Windsor on this subject.

DR. FARQUHARSON: Will the right hon. Gentleman place this matter before the authorities in art, such as the President of the Royal Academy, who might be able to give a suitable opinion?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I will consider it.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) said that prior to the recess certain arrangements were made in regard to business, and it was said that the Local Government Board Vote would stand first on Thursday, and that certain other Votes would follow. He wished to know if that arrangement stood.

MR. LOUGH: Can the right hon. Gentleman state what will be the business for Monday next?

MR A. J. BALFOUR said he understood that it would be inconvenient to take the Home Office Vote which had been suggested because the Report had not yet been published, and he, therefore, proposed to adhere to the arrangement that the Local Government Board Vote should be the first taken, and that the other Votes taken should be those in Class II. On Friday he proposed to take the Penal Servitude Bill, the Dogs Bill, and the reference of the Aliens Bill to a Grand Committee. On Monday the business would be the Committee stage of the Licensing Bill.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxxxiv., 1167.

NEW WRIT.

New Writ for the county of Cavan (West Cavan), in the room of Thomas McGovern, esquire, deceased. — (*Mr. Patrick O'Brien.*)

SUPPLY [10th Allotted Day].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. Lowther (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1904–5.

REVENUE DEPARTMENTS.

1. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £569,000, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Customs Department."

Mr. WHITLEY (Halifax) said he had handed in a notice to move the reduction of Item A in that Vote which referred to the salaries and allowances of the Superintending Establishment of the Customs. When the Vote was under discussion twelve months ago the question of the strength of the staff was raised, and there was some debate, the chief point urged being, that as the Government had quite recently come to a decision to abolish the corn tax which had been imposed in the preceding year, some fresh arrangements were necessary for the disposal of the staff which had been specially engaged for the purpose of levying the tax. It was asked whether it was right that the House should vote money for a staff which apparently would only be employed during the first three months of the financial year. The reply given by the Treasury on that occasion was that, although it had been decided to abolish the corn tax, it would be impossible to reduce the establishment for some time, as there would be considerable work to carry out. A promise was, however, given that in the following year's Estimates steps should be taken to bring about a reduction. They were at that time informed that a staff of forty-six indoor and forty-seven outdoor officers had been appointed for the purposes of the corn duty, and now he would like to know how it came about that in the present year's Estimates, instead of having a reduction of the staff and consequently a reduction of the cost, exactly the opposite had occurred, and they had got an increase in the staff. Provision was now being made for 294 men as against 262 last year. In the previous year the increase of staff had been from 231 to 262, thus showing a substantial and rapid increase to the extent of 25 per cent. of the staff in two years. When the matter was under consideration a year ago the hon. Member for Durham, who was then Financial Secretary to the Treasury, stated that there would be a good deal of extra work in connection with the readjustment and rebates following on the abolition of the corn duty, and that any reduction of the staff would be more apparent in the following year than in the present one. The hon. Member at that time deprecated the moving of a reduction in the Estimate on the ground that the Treasury had not had time to bring about any rearrangement of the staff. But his complaint was that the present Vote, instead of showing a substantial reduction in this respect, actually involved an increase to the extent of £6,000. It was an extraordinary thing that when ninety-three men had been appointed for a certain duty, and when their services apparently were no longer required for that duty, Parliament should still be called upon to vote an increase in this particular item. They were bound to make a stand against these perpetual increases. This afforded a very good illustration of the way in which when once they allowed the staff of a Department to be increased it became almost impossible to reduce it. Here was a case in which ninety-three men had been put on for a specific purpose which no longer existed, and yet there was no proposal on the part of the Government to decrease the staff, but, on the other hand, there was a proposal to make a substantial increase to it, and he, therefore, felt justified in moving to reduce the Vote by the sum of £1,000.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Item A, 1 (Superintending Establishment, Salaries and Allowances) be reduced by £1,000."—(*Mr. Whitley.*)

SIR E. DURNING-LAWRENCE (Cornwall, Truro) said that the corn duty was intended to be permanent, and the extra men engaged on account of it were not temporarily engaged. He could not see, therefore, how the staff could be reduced without providing some compensation for the men affected. Government appointments were always looked upon as more or less permanent, and when once they were made it was not easy to reduce them.

*MR. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton), who was very imperfectly heard in the Gallery, was understood to say that he was one of those who believed that work done should be adequately paid for, and he also felt that in connection with Government appointments the question of permanency was an important consideration. They could not afford to play the game of battledore and shuttlecock with Government servants. If they wanted to get the most able men to serve the country they must give them some security of tenure. There was another point to which he would like to draw the attention of the Committee, and that was the inconvenience to which passengers coming from France to this country were subjected in consequence of the Custom House arrangements. The examination of luggage at Dover and Newhaven was conducted under the most uncomfortable circumstances, involving not only the maximum of inconvenience to the passengers themselves, but often serious delay and expense, and he, therefore, hoped that the Secretary of the Treasury would be able to give a promise on the part of the Department that some improvement in this respect should be effected, and that more reasonable arrangements would be made so that passengers might not be subjected to the inconveniences which resulted from the present inadequate arrangements.

MR. ERNEST GRAY (West Ham, N.) hoped that the Secretary to the Treasury would resist the demand for a reduction of the portion of the Customs staff which was appointed to carry out what was intended to be a permanent tax. He had on many occasions pleaded in that House for the fair treatment of Customs officers, and sometimes he had been almost single-handed in that endeavour. He had protested against their being treated merely as shuttlecocks. Men joined the lower ranks of the Customs service on the understanding that certain prospects of promotion were open to them, and it was not fair that the political exigencies of the country should bear with undue severity on those who had faithfully discharged the duties entrusted to them by the State. As he understood it, whenever a new duty was imposed it involved a rearrangement of the Customs staff, which rendered it essential that a certain number of promotions should be made from the lower ranks of the service, and he certainly did protest against their having resort to that most objectionable procedure which was known as "acting" in order to carry out the duties of the Department. This principle of "acting" in order to meet temporary pressure, and then reverting to the old position, was one which he was bound to condemn. When the corn duty was imposed a certain number of officials were necessarily promoted, and their places in the ranks were filled up. On what principle could they ask those men thus temporarily promoted to revert to their old positions, and what were they to do with those who had been appointed to fill those positions? It seemed to him that if the proposal of the hon. Member for Halifax were carried it would be treating these men very unfairly.

MR. WHITLEY: What about the increase of the staff by twenty-eight men.

MR. ERNEST GRAY said he was not dealing with that point, he was simply dealing with a suggestion which to his mind was, he would not say cruel, but which was, at any rate, neither generous nor just, that the men who for a time had been called upon to perform a superior duty should simply be relegated back to their old positions for the sole reason that Parliament had decided to abolish a certain tax. It appeared to him that the proposal of the hon. Member showed a very slight knowledge of the conditions obtaining in the Customs service. For years past there had been grave discontent in that service, and efforts had been made by Mr. Hanbury and others to bring about a different state of affairs and to secure a contented service. Those efforts had met with a considerable amount of success, and he could conceive nothing more likely to disturb the present happy condition of affairs than to carry out the proposal of the hon. Member for Halifax. Let them look at the position of matters. A man possibly had been looking forward to promotion for many years, say, to the first class of examining officers. At last he obtained it, and in consequence he placed his family in a more comfortable home and in better surroundings. Was it reasonable that, at the end of a couple of years, simply because Parliament had abandoned its intention to impose a certain tax, that officer should be asked to go back to his former position? In his opinion such a suggestion was most unfair. He had gathered from conversations he had had with representatives of that section of the State's servants that in the last few months something like contentment had been secured in this great body of Civil servants, and he, therefore, appealed to his hon. friend the Secretary to the Treasury not to take any steps which would be calculated to destroy that feeling of contentment. Let him remember that promotion when once made should be maintained. It was generally automatic, and it certainly ought not to be unnecessarily interfered with.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY (Mr. VICTOR CAVENDISH, Derbyshire, W.) said that the hon. Member for Halifax, in referring to the promise given last year by the hon. Member for Durham, that the staff, increased on account of the corn duty, would be again reduced after the repeal of that duty, omitted to state also that his hon. friend had said that, on the other hand, an increase would probably be necessary on account of the Sugar Convention. In the Estimate for 1903–4, £17,400 extra was asked for in respect of the collection of the corn duty, and in that for the year 1904–5 £16,000 additional was demanded in respect of the sugar duty. Thus, although the Treasury had been able to effect a reduction in respect to the collection of the corn duty, he regretted to say that nearly the whole of that reduction had been absorbed by the increased expenditure necessary for the collection of the sugar duty. Nearly the whole of the increase in the Vote was due to the increase in the Statistical Department, for which a demand had been generally made. With regard to the inconveniences complained of by passengers travelling between this country and the Continent, he had received many complaints himself, but he did not see any practical methods for their removal. Still, if any were brought to his notice he would consider them.

*MR. CLAUDE HAY: You might call upon the railway companies to provide better accommodation.

MR. VICTOR CAVENDISH said that was rather a large order. He would like to know what the specific complaints against the railway companies were. He remembered that one suggestion was made to him in that direction, and he declined to put the burden on the British taxpayer. He was then asked if the proposed facilities would be granted provided the money was subscribed by the public. To that he assented, but he believed that only £5 of the £125 required was forthcoming, and the proposal consequently fell to the ground. Still, bearing in mind that he was extremely unwilling to place any further charge on the Exchequer, he could only promise to consider any practical suggestions that might be made.

MR. COHEN (Islington, E.) said that in his opinion it would be not merely unjust and ungenerous, but it would also be cruel to degrade officials who had been promoted for the purpose of a special tax, and to reduce their stipends because, forsooth, it pleased Parliament to abolish certain taxes. He had more than once deplored the extravagant and wasteful way in which money was expended by Government Departments, but he did not think that the hard-working, industrious, Customs House officials, who did their best to qualify themselves for the service of the State, should be treated in the manner suggested by the mover of the Amendment, and he, therefore, hoped that the Financial Secretary to the Treasury would not accept the Amendment, which would involve unjust and unmerited treatment of a very efficient class of officials.

MR. J. F. HOPE (Sheffield, Brightside) said he wished to draw attention to the manner in which certain classes of Customs officers were appointed. He considered that the system of appointment by nomination was open to grave and serious abuse, and he would like to see them placed on the same footing in this respect as other Civil servants.

*THE CHAIRMAN: Order, order! I do not think that point can be raised under this item.

MR. J. F. HOPE said he would deal with it later. But he desired to oppose the reduction. The Committee must bear in mind not only the present, but the future position of the Customs service. Probably in a year or two the service would have new and heavy duties thrown upon it, not only greater in extent than those which it carried out at present, but far more varied and complicated in character, and although the present Financial Secretary to the Treasury might not wish to see such a development he must be prepared for it and make his arrangements accordingly. They could not suddenly engage new officers to fulfil these complicated duties. A certain amount of training was necessary, and though the hon. Member for King's Lynn was a great economist, he surely was not so cheeseparing as to approve this proposed reduction. With regard to Customs examination at Dover and elsewhere, he had heard complaints of incivility, but he was bound to say he had not personally experienced such treatment. He thought the fault rested not so much with the officials as with the conditions under which they had to carry out their duties. In Russia, where the examination was of a far more strict character, he was struck with the civility of the officers, and certainly Englishmen were not less courteous than Russians. He suggested that a small travelling Commission should be sent throughout Europe to inquire into the system of examination at the principal European frontiers. So far from supporting any reduction in salaries in this Department, he would be prepared, if it were in order, to propose that some of them should be increased. What would happen if the reduction that had been moved were carried? Perhaps hon. Members opposite thought the Government would go out; but they would do nothing of the kind. All that would happen would be the loss of £1,000 from the salaries of a number of hard-working officials.

*MR. MACONOCHIE (Aberdeenshire, E.) agreed that the salaries of the officers were not ranged according to duties performed, and submitted that whereas an official in the Customs service, who had millions of money to deal with, only received £800 a year, a man holding an equally responsible position in a private business would never get less than £2,000 or £2,500 a year. They all, he said, agreed that there were many anomalies and many things that might be improved in the service, but Rome was not built in a day, and he did not think the hon. Member for Halifax himself expected that they could remove these anomalies in a few days. With regard to the Customs accommodation, he remarked that some railways gave better accommodation than others, and he did not know why they should not be made to improve upon that accommodation; certainly any suggestion of a Member which would have the tendency of compelling the railway companies to give better accommodation would have the support of Members on both sides of the House. They had heard a good deal about the label system, but he had never seen a more simple one than that prevailing in the passenger service between Canada and New York, and he did not see why similar arrangements should not be made for people coming from and going to the Continent. He was sure it was not the intention of the hon. Member for Halifax, the mover of the reduction, to reduce the salary of any competent servant; and he felt they were in agreement that in some cases they paid too high salaries and that in many other cases they paid too low salaries; and when the hon. Member for Halifax considered the amount of bribery prevailing in other parts of the world, he thought he would also agree that there was no possibility of bribing the Customs House officers in Great Britain. He had always received equally as much civility and attention from the officers in Great Britain as from the officers of any other country; and he had never experienced the absolute necessity in some cases, in other parts of the world, of bribing the officers. However much they might disagree as to the amount of their remuneration, they would agree that the Customs House officers of Great Britain were honest, loyal, and perfectly straightforward.

Mr. WHITLEY said he should like to point out to the Secretary to the Treasury that the increase necessitated by the Sugar Convention was provided for under the next item of the Estimate. The hon. Gentleman had therefore not given any explanation of the causes which led to the demand for an increase of the staff by twenty-eight men, and, as a consequence, he would feel it his duty to press his Motion to reduce the Vote, to a division.

Mr. CHARLES DEVLIN (Galway) complained of the great inconvenience which passengers arriving at Londonderry suffered on account of the bad accommodation for the examination of luggage, and said the result was that many Canadians who had once suffered, declined to again travel by that route, with the result that Ireland suffered the loss of a great deal of traffic.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis) said it was interesting after a short holiday to observe the Front Bench filled by Under-Secretaries driven back before their masters, not one Cabinet Minister being present, and the House occupied in listening to the delightful oratory of the hon. Member for the Brightside Division, whose rising was always a signal to him that the Government found itself in a momentary minority. This was all a good illustration of the position to which they had been reduced by the working of the new Rules. With regard to the suggestion that an official who had to deal with interests involving many millions ought to have more than £800 a year, he reminded hon. Members that the great glory of the Civil Service was that it was paid partly in money and partly in honour. For this reason men were proud of their position in it and ready to do most important and praiseworthy work for small salaries and the assurance of a pension. His advice to the Committee was to beware of creating new Civil servants, but stand by those already in the service, so that its high repute should remain unimpaired. When they created a new Civil servant he became something like the old man of the sea. He hung round their necks, and they had not the resource of Sinbad the Sailor—they could not make him drunk and knock him on the head. Therefore let them jealously watch all proposed increases of staff.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 55; Noes, 110. (Division List No. 128).

AYES.

Burns, John
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Causton, Richard Knight
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan
Devlin, Charles Ramsay (Galw'y
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Harcourt, Lewis V. Rossendale
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk.
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Kitson, Sir James
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Shackleton, David James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R (Northants.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal

Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr)
Tomkinson, James
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Weir, James Galloway
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whitley and Mr. Ainsworth.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn. Gerald W. (Leeds
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bignold, Arthur
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boulnois, Edmund
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. A (Worc
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Denny, Colonel
Dewar, Sir T. R. (Tower Hamlets
Dickson, Charles Scott
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A Akers
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Fardell, Sir T. George
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'rH'mlets
Gore, Hn. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.)
Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.)
Gunter, Sir Robert
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nderry
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley)
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Hunt, Rowland
Hutton, John (Yorks. N.R.)
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Kimber, Henry
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks. N.R
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants., Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Lowe, Francis William
Lloyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Malcolm, Ian
Mitchell, William (Burnley
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. Graham (Bute
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Percy, Earl
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Pym, C. Guy
Rea, Russell
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Sir Harry S. (Limehouse
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tuff, Charles
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E. (Taunton
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

Original Question again proposed.

MR. J. H. LEWIS (Flint Boroughs) was surprised that the hon. Member for the Brightside Division was not now in his place in order to discuss the very important question of the system of appointing Customs boatmen. He believed there was not a Member of that House who did not consider that this system of political appointments was thoroughly bad. It was a relic of the bad days when political and Party appointments prevailed throughout the whole Civil Service. What earthly reason was there for appointing Customs boatmen on these lines. Of course he was not suggesting that the Gentleman responsible for making them was not actuated by the most conscientious motives. Was the Chief Whip expected to make these appointments of the Customs boatmen on purely Party nomination? He would ask the right hon. Gentleman how often he had appointed a man on the recommendation of hon. Gentlemen opposite? It would have been very unnatural if he did anything of the kind. He was aware that these men had to undergo a slight examination; but his point was that the whole thing was radically unsound. It was wrong in principle, and ought to be abolished. It interfered with the personal convenience of hon. Members. They were constantly receiving applications from people who considered they were competent for a place in the service, and that involved a large amount of correspondence. If these appointments were to be made in the future to a greater extent than in the past, owing to pending changes in the fiscal policy of the country, they ought to be made on the ground of efficiency alone, and should be removed entirely from the control of Party influence.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES said that it should be remembered that there were still many appointments in the gift of the Crown for which the Crown itself was responsible. But, if the system at present existing in regard to the appointment of Customs boatmen was wrong, then the whole system by which the officers of the Navy were chosen was also wrong. The two systems were identical. The cadets for the Navy and the boatmen for the Customs were nominated by threes, and one got the appointment. If the Customs system was vicious, then the right hon. Gentleman opposite must be prepared to admit that the appointment of naval cadets was vicious too. He did not think that the Patronage Secretary, who had the nomination of these Customs boatmen in his hands, allowed Party feeling to influence him, any more than the First Lord of the Admiralty did in the nomination of cadets for entry into the Navy; or that the hon. Gentleman only entertained applications from his own side of the House. It was within his own knowledge, when he was on the other side of the House, that the Patronage Secretary received these applications candidly and impartially. When he nominated any man for appointment, the strength of his application lay in the fact that the Secretary to the Treasury was so convinced that he would not recommend anyone who was not qualified for the post, that the hon. Gentleman was equally prepared to entertain his recommendation as one from his own side of the House. It could not be said that this system was a bad one. It was true it was old, but it afforded by no means any facility for his hon. friend to buy political support from any Members of this House. He did not think it would enable his hon. friend to bring in a majority to the House on the first day after the holidays, or get the Government out of a tight place. As a matter of fact he believed the existing system produced excellent men for the Customs service. No one could say that the boarding officers in the Customs did not do their duty well, although he admitted that it was an anomalous system.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER (Staffordshire, Lichfield) said that while he agreed with much that had been said by the hon. Member for King's Lynn, he did not think that the Customs boatmen's appointments were carried on on exactly the same system as the nomination of naval cadets. There was an idea that the Patronage Secretary was more likely to appoint men of his own way of thinking; and there was no doubt the system was used to recommend political supporters for appointment. He understood some time ago that this system was to be discontinued, and that private Members should no longer be able to make nominations to the Patronage Secretary—in fact that these appointments were no longer to be regarded in any sense as political, but to be made on the same system as in any other branch of the Civil Service. This old relic of political patronage should be done away with. He was quite sure that the hon. Baronet made these nominations without any strict Party feeling; but, still, it ought not to be in the power of the Patronage Secretary to use these nominations as a political instrument. He hoped that there would be some assurance from the Treasury Bench that the system would be given up.

*MAJOR EVANS GORDON (Tower Hamlets, Stepney) said he wished to call the attention of the Committee and of the Patronage Secretary to the Treasury to another question in relation to the position of the Customs boatmen. The attitude of hon. Members on both sides was often inconsistent, because their calls for economy in public expenditure were accompanied by demands for increased expenditure in other directions. He, himself, was an advocate for economy, provided efficiency could be obtained at the same time. The State should treat its servants with a reasonable amount of consideration. If it could be shown, as he thought it could be, that the Customs boatmen were miserably paid, that their duties were of the very greatest importance, that their prospects of promotion were very small indeed, then their claim for an improvement in their condition should not be rejected on the general ground of a necessity for economy. Another point he had to bring before the Committee was the increasing practice of public servants bringing pressure to bear on Members of Parliament. That was a custom which ought not to be encouraged in any way. But in this case there was no question of any pressure. The total number of men in this service was 992, scattered over the whole country; and therefore the influence which they could exercise politically was practically *nil.* He could say that no pressure had been brought to bear upon him; he had investigated the subject for himself, and he thought their case was a good one. Hence he ventured to bring it before the Committee.

The name of "boatmen" was a complete misnomer. That term led to a very great misunderstanding as to the duties which these men performed. The remuneration they received might be sufficient if they only pulled boats out to vessels coming into port. But hon. Members would be surprised to learn that these so-called boatmen were —some of them—the men who examined the luggage at Charing Cross and Victoria —he hoped unsuccessfully when hon. Members arrived from their holidays on the Continent. Boats were now very little used; Customs officers went out to ships on arriving in port in steam launches. These men came in contact with and performed work on behalf of many Government Departments. They must possess a thorough knowledge of Health Regulations, Board of Trade Regulations, Explosive Acts, the Merchandise Marks Act, Agricultural Acts referring to cattle, dogs, etc. Their many duties included the boarding of vessels for foreign ports, the issuing of certificates of *pratiques,* examining crews' private and ships' surplus dutiable stores; they had to examine passengers' luggage; they had to collect the duty for goods that were found to be dutiable; they had to make a thorough rummage of the whole vessel, and, although these duties were done under the supervision of a superior officer, the actual work was done by the men themselves. In regard to passengers' baggage, they had to use the greatest amount of tact and keenness, and very few complaints were received considering the enormous number of people who arrived by sea in this country. The whole reputation of the Customs Department was in the hands of these men. Their boarding duty required the utmost vigilance, because the crews were often leaving their ships, and they had to be closely searched. With regard to rummaging, few people who had not been over a ship under-stood what it meant. The boatmen had to compete in knowledge with skilled artisans in the engine room and elsewhere. Every case of smuggling showed some new and exceedingly cunning dodge for concealing contraband goods. The duty was a very difficult and also a very unhealthy one, needing immense care and energy, and often involving personal courage on behalf of the men. The forecastle of a foreign ship was frequently a very unhealthy place, and further, the men had to face remonstrance, abuse, and sometimes violence on the part of sailors belonging to every race on the habitable globe, and speaking almost every language under the sun. It was well known that smuggling still went on, and its prevention neccessitated the very greatest vigilance on the part of the Customs boatmen. As to the dangers of the calling, the men had to board ships at every hour of the day and night and rummage in a high temperature, afterwards coming out into the cold air, which involved a considerable risk to health. They also incurred risk to life and limb. So much was that the case, that the Civil Service Insurance Society required 73 per cent. higher premium against accidents for these men than for a member of any other branch of the Civil Service. The men were in no sense boatmen. They held a Commission from the Crown, the first paragraph of which stated that the man was appointed an officer of Customs to be employed on any duties relating to the Customs. If a doctor went his rounds in a cab he would not be regarded as a cabman; and the Customs boatmen went to their work in boats, which was all they had to do with them. Why should they not be called waterguard officers, or assistant preventive officers. It would be a concession to the men, and it would not cost anything to give them a name to which they were entitled.

He desired to call attention to the pay the men received. They commenced at a salary of £55 a year, rising by increments of £1 10s. 0d. per annum for five years, and then by £2 10s. 0d. per annum to the maximum of £85. For five years, therefore, they were doing the duties he had described for a little over a £1 a week; and in fifteen years a man might reach a salary of 32s. or 33s. a week. He would ask the Committee if they considered that that was sufficient pay for the duties the men performed. The Government claimed to be model employers but their model seemed to be a bad one. A man might be six years a boatman before he got 24s. a week, or 1s. a week less than a policeman received in his first year. He submitted that the duties of a boatman were every bit as important and quite as dangerous as the duties of a policeman. Of course, it might be argued that the salary was sufficient because a number of men came forward who were willing to accept it; but he did not believe that that was any justification for the State sweating its servants, or giving them a salary on which it was very difficult for them to live. Further, the men were being constantly shifted about, and had to spend a very considerable sum in travelling expenses, and also on rent, especially in London. They had also to keep up a respectable appearance, and to dress themselves well. He knew one case in which a man earning between £60 and £70 a year spent £30 a year in travelling expenses and rent, having only the small balance of £30 or £40 on which to maintain his wife and family. His hon. friend referred to the honour of belonging to the service; but it was hardly a satisfactory answer to those men to tell them to think of the honour of their employment. With them it was a question of bread and cheese. Even after fifteen years service, they were getting less pay than an ordinary roadsweeper in the employment of any borough council. Certainly they ought to be better paid. Recently, the star system was introduced by which after ten years a man might get £2 10s. 0d. extra if he received a star. Therefore, a man should be at least ten years in the service before he received a living wage. Juniors, of course, received no benefit at all from the star system. The stars were given for good conduct and efficiency after ten years service; but a soldier could get a badge after two years service; and, therefore, good conduct and efficiency were recognised in the Army eight years before they were recognised in the case of the Customs boatmen. Many of the men who had twenty years service had only one star, and great dissatisfaction was caused by the fact that no one seemed to know on what basis the stars were given. The remedy was that a man qualified for a star should receive it, or if not, that the reasons for his not receiving it should be clearly given, in order that there might not be that discrimination which at present caused great discontent.

With reference to Sunday duty, the boatmen were the only members of the Civil Service who were constantly employed on Sundays without extra pay. They were often employed three out of four Sundays, and always two out of three Sundays. Formerly they used to get 1s. per Sunday when employed, but that was commuted by an increase of £5 a year in the salaries of men in the service previous to 1895. The men who came into the service since then and who worked on Sundays received absolutely no remuneration for that work. He believed that that was unique in the entire Civil Service; and that these men should be paid for Sunday work, just as a road sweeper would be paid time and a half if called upon to work on Sundays. All the other Customs grades were paid for Sunday work, and he did not see why the Customs boatmen, whose work was just as important, should be exempted. Again, the prospect of promotion was very poor. Out of the 992 men employed, only twenty-seven were promoted per annum, so that the junior men had really no prospect of promotion at all. That was all the more reason why they should be better paid than they were at present. It had been said that they were very honourable men, that they performed their duties well and did not accept bribes; but he wished to point out that they were peculiarly susceptible to temptation. All sorts of in and out work went on on board ships; and certainly money was offered to them to wink their eyes at what was going on;

but whether they accepted it or not was another matter. He did not think it was right the State should connive in exposing those men to such very serious temptation by not giving them sufficient money to live on. He felt very strongly on the matter; it was not a question of pressure at all; it was a case in which a few hundred men were distinctly underpaid and over-worked, and he hoped that the Financial Secretary would be able to satisfy him by granting a full inquiry into the subject, if he could not immediately grant the concessions which were demanded. He was sure that an inquiry would substantiate everything he had said, and until he had received an assurance from the Financial Secretary that it would be held, he would move the reduction of the Vote by £100.

Motion made, and Question proposed' "That Item B, 1 (Port Establishment, Salaries and Allowances) be reduced by £100."— (*Major Evans Gordon.*)

Mr. MUNRO FERGUSON (Leith Burghs) said that the point raised by the hon. Gentleman with reference to Sunday labour was a sound one. The same complaint had been made to him by Customs boatmen in Scotland. He had inquired into the matter, and it appeared to him that the men should either be paid for Sunday labour, or that the work should be so distributed as to allow Sund y or an equivalent day to the men. He believed that to be a real grievance. He would not discuss the question of pay, because he thought it inexpedient where it could be avoided, but he would say as regarded the Customs boatmen that they put their case in a different way to that in which other branches of the Civil Service put theirs. They did not attempt to put pressure upon Members of Parliament, as in the case of the Post Office servants, whose conduct in many cases amounted almost to a scandal. He hoped the Financial Secretary would see his way to remedy the grievance with reference to Sunday labour. He had always understood that the nominations to the position of Customs boatmen were likely to go the way of nominations to the Post Office. There was no reason why it should not be so, and it would be a good thing to get rid of these nominations altogether, but, if they went, then there should be some machinery to insure that the appointments should be regularly made and the best men selected to fill the positions.

Mr. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD (Liverpool, West Derby) called attention to the meagre pay of the lower grade of preventive men. He said there were two sections of preventive officers, the lower grade consisting of 321 and the higher of sixty-eight men. The duties of those officers were of a highly important and onerous character, and it was essential to have highly respectable and trustworthy men to fill these positions, but the salary paid was far too little. A man had to be a Customs boatman for seventeen years before he could obtain a position as preventive officer, and upon being appointed he received the small salary of £95, rising by £5 increments to £150, which meant that a man in order to obtain the maximum salary must serve thirty years. These men complained that they were employed on twenty-eight Sundays during the year, on fourteen of which they had to do night duty, for which they received no extra pay. He contended that to employ men practically regularly on Sundays was contrary to the practice of large public concerns, and also to the practice of the Civil Service. This was the only class of Civil servants which received no extra pay for Sunday duty, and he appealed to the hon. Gentleman to institute an inquiry into the matter.

Mr. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland) supported the suggestion, and expressed a hope that the Secretary to the Treasury would see his way to appoint a small Committee to investigate the very moderate demands of these men, who only desired that certain privileges, if, indeed, they were not rights, should be recognised. With regard to the patronage side of the question which had been raised by the hon. Member for King's Lynn, he desired to take this opportunity of testifying that the hon. and gallant Gentleman opposite had on more than one occasion appointed the best persons he could find to fill the positions quite irrespective of the politics of those who had nominated them.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY (Sir A. ACLAND-HOOD, Somersetshire, Wellington) said, with regard to the question of patronage, not being a constitutional lawyer he was not prepared to offer an opinion as to whether the method was good or bad. He accepted it as he found it and had always endeavoured to appoint the best men. He agreed with the hon. and gallant Member for Stepney that £55 was not a proper sum to pay these men, and that for that salary the best men could not be found. The list at present in use gave the ages as 19 to 23, and on looking through the list he found a great number of names had been down for some years who would lose their chance of appointment if the list was altered. His view as to the age for these appointments should be from 17 years to 20, but in view of the large number of names now on the list he had arranged that the age limit in next year's list should be from 17 to 22, and afterwards it should be from 17 to 20. With regard to the financial part of the discussion he would leave that to the Financial Secretary to deal with.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.) said that on more than one occasion he had called attention to the case of the Customs watchers who, strictly speaking, came under the head of "Outdoor officers." As outdoor officers died or retired outdoor watchers were appointed to their positions. As the Committee was probably aware he had dealt with this and other cognate questions on several occasions from the simple point of view of wages. The Government had over and over again professed to act in a line with the best employers throughout the country, but in the case of the Customs watchers there was a particular phase which differentiated it from the case of labour either at the Admiralty or the War Office. In the case of these Customs watchers, the Government had taken advantage of the fact that the persons from whom the Customs watchers were recruited were all either old soldiers, sailors, or policemen and in receipt of pensions, in order to sweat the wages of these men. The position of the watchers was that some years ago the lowest class employed under the Customs with the exception of the boatmen were the outdoor officers who were in receipt of £101 a year. At the time they were appointed it was difficult to get men to perform these duties, which required undoubted integrity on the part of those who performed them, and also a certain amount of education. It was subsequently found that much cheaper men could be obtained for one portion of the work, and a new class was created, the higher duties being put upon the superior officers and the lower duties upon the new class called "watchers." Those watchers were drawn from the Government services, soldiers, sailors, and policemen, and were men in receipt of a pension; and what he asked was that these men should be paid the same wage and put in the same position as men who had no pension at all. The duties performed by these men were similar to those performed by the "lockers" of the various dock companies, who were paid from 25s. to 30s. a week, whilst these watchers only received 21s. a week. Another point which irritated these men very much was that one section of the outdoor officers who performed almost precisely the same duties as themselves received £101 a year. He asked the hon. Gentleman opposite to treat these men as he would treat any other class in the employ of the Government, and take no notice, in fixing their pay, of the fact that they were pensioners, but simply pay them the current rate of wage in their locality. They performed most onerous duties and should be paid a fair wage. The watchers complained also that whereas formerly they were allowed 8d. for overtime, although that charge was never paid by the Government, but by the owners of the vessels, the Government had thought fit to reduce it to 6d. Something had been done by the predecessor in office of the hon. Gentleman with regard to the uniform of the Customs watchers, but the men now asked that they should be given a serge jacket every two years for summer wear. Another matter they desired to put forward was the question of annual leave, which they wished increased to twelve days in order that they might be placed on an equality with the rest of the service. They endeavoured to place their grievances before the Department in a legitimate manner, but the Customs authorities would not do anything, and that was why he had brought the matter forward. It was only a matter of a few hundred pounds to make the initial rate of pay 24s. instead of 21s. for Customs watchers.

MR. CAUSTON (Southwark, W.) said his hon. friend had stated the case of the watchers so clearly and fully that it was unnecessary for him to go over the ground again, but he wished to add a few words in support of the appeal his hon. and gallant friend had made on behalf of the watchers. He believed that these men had a real grievance which would be remedied, he was sure, if the hon. Gentleman opposite would look into this matter closely himself. The Committee had heard what a low rate of wages was paid to these men and the small increase they were demanding, and it was a question which was well worthy of the consideration of the Government.

MR. VICTOR CAVENDISH said that in regard to the Customs boatmen he thought the hon. and gallant Member for Stepney had gone a little too far. He quite appreciated what had been said, but it should be remembered that they had to work under the supervision of higher officers upon whom devolved the duty of seeing that the work was properly carried out. He did not think the responsibility placed upon these men was quite so great as his hon. friend had made out. Cases had been gone into most carefully in the past by his predecessors in office, and he would endeavour to follow their footsteps and look into these matters personally. He thought that during the past few years these men had advanced their position a great deal. With regard to the preventive officers, the hon. Member who had raised the question had given him warning, and had set forth fully their grievances in a letter. In his reply he took a considerable amount of trouble, and he had given him all the information he possibly could. He agreed that they had extremely responsible duties to perform, but he did not think they had a strong case for increased pay. With regard to Sunday labour they did everything they could to reduce it, but there were certain conditions of the service where it was impossible to avoid Sunday work. He wished to point out that it was distinctly understood in the terms upon which these men entered the service that Sunday labour would be expected from them. Every effort was made to divide the Sunday work equally and to allow as many men to get off on Sundays as possible. If they allowed extra pay for Sunday work he was afraid they would have to consider whether the pay for that class of men would not have to be reduced, because the present rate was based distinctly on the ground that it included Sunday labour, and he could not hold out any hopes that he would be able to grant an increase. With regard to the Customs watchers, he would look most carefully into the questions which had been raised by the hon. and gallant Member for West Newington. He was glad to be in possession of the views of hon. Members on these points, and he would carefully consider the points which had been raised.

MAJOR EVANS GORDON thanked the Secretary to the Treasury for what he had promised to do, but with great regret he heard him state that he declined to go into the question of Sunday pay. He could not agree with the hon. Member that 21s. was a sufficient wage for young men between seventeen and twenty-four years of age who had to work on Sundays. He begged leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Original Question again proposed.

CAPTAIN NORTON said the Secretary to the Treasury had given him nothing but smooth words in reply, and he did expect him to give way on the question of annual leave. These were the only men who had not this privilege. He wished to remind the Committee that they had the example of a great democratic, directly elected, public body, the London County Council, who had to deal with thousands of employees of all grades and classes, and this body had never experienced any of the difficulties which had been mentioned, because when the employees had a grievance it was brought before the committee of the

London County Council by the representatives of the men, and they ascertained what was a proper wage. The result was that they had an entirely satisfied and efficient body of employees. Even road sweepers were paid 24s. a week, and yet the Government took men in the prime of life, who had to pass a medical examination, trustworthy men of good standing with unblemished characters in the police, the Army, or the Navy, and paid them 21s. a week to perform responsible duties. He asked that the minimum should be 24s. a week. The majority of these men already had that wage, but owing to the large number of young men in the service there were many who could never hope to reach the figure stated. He begged to move a reduction of the Vote by £200.

Motion made, and Question put, "That Item B, 1 (Port Establishment, Salaries and Allowances) be reduced by £200."—(*Captain Norton.*)

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 55; Noes, 132. (Division List No. 129.)

AYES

Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Burns, John
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Causton, Richard Knight
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Dayies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Furness, Sir Christopher
Grant, Corrie
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Harcourt, Lewis V.(Rossendale
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hobhouse, C.E.H. (Bristol, E.)
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk.
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)
Partington, Oswald
Rea, Russell
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robson, William Snowdon
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Shackleton, David James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Wallace, Robert
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)

TELLERS FOR THE AYES.—Captain Norton and Mr. Crooks.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Allsopp, Hon. George
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arrol, Sir William
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt. Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boulnois, Edmund
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Bull, William James
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. A (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Davenport, William Bromley
Denny, Colonel
Dewar, Sir T. R. (Tower Hamlets
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt. Hon. Sir Joseph C.
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Douglas Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hon, Sir William Hart
Elibank, Master of
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.)
Gunter, Sir Robert
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Marq of (L'nd'nderry
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Heath, A. Howard (Hanley)
Heath, James (Staffords., N. W.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Hunt, Rowland
Hutton, John (Yorks. N.R.)
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Kimber, Henry
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks N R
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants., Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col, Charles W. (Evesham
Lowe, Francis William

Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Murray, Rt Hn. A. Graham (Bute
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Rankin, Sir James
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Sir Harry S. (Limehouse
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset)
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.)
Stroyan, John
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tuff, Charles
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E. (Taunton
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und (Lyne
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES.—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

Original Question again proposed.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.) said he wished to make a protest with regard to a taunt which was sometimes heard from the other side of the House. It was said that those who were in favour of increasing the pay of these Customs officers were going contrary to their advocacy of economy. That was perfectly ridiculous. If economies were to be effected they would have to deal with matters involving millions, and not merely with items where, as in this instance, £50 or £100 would do all that was required by the proposal of his hon. friend. He wanted a little information regarding some of the great matters with which the Vote dealt. The Committee would notice that a tremendous expansion of Customs Revenue had taken place during the last few years. From a table in the Report it appeared that the Customs Revenue of the country had increased from £23,000,000 ten years ago to £37,000,000 now. There were certain circumstances connected with this development of revenue that must be of considerable interest both to the Committee and the country. The increased revenue had been obtained by the increase of old duties. In regard to the inspection of tea he found from a statement on page 10 that £240 was the remuneration of eight surveyors, being £30 a year each. Who were the inspectors, and what were their duties? Four years since the duty on tea was increased by 50 per cent. There was evidence in the Report that attempts were made to bring low qualities of tea into the country. In the years 1895 to 1899 there was an annual average of fifty seizures, but after the tea duty was increased by 50 per cent. there were 260 seizures the first year, and 404 the following year. He wanted some information beyond what was contained in the Report as to what these Customs officers had done, and what the Department was doing. What was the quantity of tea dealt with? The whole matter was wrapt in mystery, and people interested in this business could not find out what the Department was doing. He would like to know what were the circumstances under which the remarkable increase had taken place spoken of on page 65 of the Customs Report, and where the teas were exported to.

*THE CHAIRMAN: That has nothing to do with this Vote.

MR. LOUGH said that this was a proceeding connected with the Customs officers. He wanted to know what these inspectors were doing, and what they had done with this tea.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The place to which the tea is finally exported has nothing to do with this Vote.

MR. LOUGH asked whether he could not inquire what the inspectors of tea did with this tea? There was now a further increase of the tea duty, and there would have to be an increase of the staff, and he wished to know what was going to be done to protect the country from being flooded with bad and inferior tea. He also asked for some information with regard to the working of the system of certificates of origin and of the bonding of sugar under the Sugar Convention Act. Had any precautions been taken to prevent false certificates of origin being given?

*THE CHAIRMAN: How does the hon. Member connect the working of a particular Act with this Vote?

MR. LOUGH said that, with great deference, he wanted to find out how these new duties which the Board of Customs were undertaking were being discharged, and what extra charge had been incurred by the adoption of this new system.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member is perfectly entitled to ask whether there has been any increase of the staff, but not to enter into a general criticism of the Sugar Convention Act. The policy of the Act is outside this particular Vote.

MR. LOUGH said he did not want to criticise the Sugar Convention Act, or any of these new taxes. He would have another opportunity of doing so; but what he wanted was some information as to whether the new system of demanding certificates of origin of sugar imports and of bonding sugar was working smoothly.

MR. LOUIS SINCLAIR (Essex, Romford) said that the Committee must have listened with some gratification to the demands for economy put forth by hon. Gentlemen opposite. He wished to ask for a small increase of expenditure to provide for additional Customs House officers. A system ought to be established by which boats carrying a certain number of passengers should be accommodated with a Customs House officer, and that provision should be made for the examination of luggage before it was despatched to the Continent. The French Government were willing to establish in London a Customs House office for this purpose; but, up to the present, the Treasury were not willing to provide the necessary sum for a similiar office in Paris A small charge on each person having his luggage examined in this way would cover all the expenses of the office, and the adoption of the system would save all the delay, trouble, friction, and annoyance that was now entailed on passengers.

MR. VICTOR CAVENDISH said he could assure his hon. friend that any practical proposal in the direction he had indicated would receive his most careful and sympathetic consideration. He was afraid he could not give the information as to sugar bonding and certificates of origin desired by the hon. Member for Islington, but if that hon. Member would put a Question on the Paper he would endeavour to furnish him with it. The sum of £240 to which the hon. Gentleman had called attention represented allowances to the eight surveyors whose duty it was to deal with tea which was certified to be unwholesome and injurious to health. He was not an expert, but he was told that tea might be unpleasant to the taste and the smell, but at the same time it might not be necessarily unwholesome. Those officials had to deal with the tea after it had been certified as unwholesome and injurious to health, and a certain allowance had to be given to them for that work.

MR. LOUGH: What quantity of that tea had been dealt with?

MR. VICTOR CAVENDISH: I cannot tell the hon. Member offhand.

MR. WHITLEY said there was a sum of £4,660 on page 10 for port allowances. These were extras. Now, there was no more severe critic of these allowances on this Vote than the late Mr. Hanbury, who kept up a vigorous attack upon them and said he was determined to get rid of them. He was surprised to find that there was no sign of the present Financial Secretary taking any steps to remove these allowances; in fact, they were increasing. There was an item of £1,535 for "star" allowances to boatmen for rummaging, which was an entirely new item on the Votes. The Financial Secretary ought to explain what those allowances were for. He would also press the hon. Gentleman for an assurance that the matter would really be dealt with. The entire Estimates were confused by footnotes on every page. On one page a man's salary was given; and on the next page it was shown that he was receiving £50 or £100 additional as an allowance. That was very unsatisfactory. It was also very peculiar that the rewards for the capture of smugglers remained the same. He did not know if the number of smugglers captured annually was the same; but if not, he wished to know what became of any sum that might remain over. He begged to move the reduction of the Vote by the sum of £1,500 in respect of allowances.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Item B, 1 (Port Establishment, Salaries and Allowances) be reduced by £1,500."—(*Mr. Whitley.*)

Mr. VICTOR CAVENDISH said that the Committee had been discussing the wages and emoluments of those men during the afternoon. Now, when a Vote was reached which conferred on the men certain pecuniary advantages, objection was taken to it. The whole tendency of the debate had been to ask for an increase in the salary of every class of men employed, and then, when a Vote was reached in which something had been done for the men, to move a reduction to it. Allowances might or might not be a satisfactory method of dealing with the question; but where special work was done there must be special remuneration given for it. It was not possible for him to give an undertaking to remove the Vote, as, if it were removed, increased expenditure would in the end be incurred.

Mr. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs) said that the hon. Gentleman did not appear to appreciate the point of his hon. friend. His hon. friend was a friend of economy; and, instead of lecturing him, the hon. Gentleman ought to welcome him as a co-operative worker in his own cause. Their contention was in regard to increased pay that it ought to be provided on a certain specific basis. Allowances were not at all in accordance with ideas of economy, nor were they satisfactory to the men themselves. The allowances might be given to the workmen, and that was a system which could not be defended. The merits of the men ought to be recognised and they ought to be rewarded accordingly. His hon. friend had raised a very important point; and he hoped, as a protest, that he would press his Amendment to a division.

Mr. VICTOR CAVENDISH said he ought to explain that the stars were granted for good conduct and efficiency when a man had served ten, fifteen, and twenty years.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES said he wished to know on what principle the allowances were granted. Did every boatman get a star; and, if not, what was the proportion of the men who did?

Mr. VICTOR CAVENDISH said that every boatman whose conduct was good and who was efficient received a star at the end of ten, fifteen, and twenty years.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES asked if every boatman got a star?

Mr. VICTOR CAVENDISH said that was so if his conduct was good and he was efficient.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES asked what was the proportion of the men whose conduct was good and who were efficient?

Mr. VICTOR CAVENDISH said he was unable at the moment to answer that Question.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES said that evidently the allowances were given by favour. Every man who did not get a star must be a man of bad conduct and ought not to be retained in the service. This was a very objectionable system. The stars were given at the discretion of the Commissioners, and that was at variance with the entire principle on which the Civil Service was based. It was an admission that the conduct of the men who did not get a star was bad; and they ought to be discharged or their pay reduced. The star allowance was no part of the regular pay; it was an entirely novel and objectionable system, and was open, therefore, to very great animadversion, and its effect was to produce the greatest jealousy among the men. Smith and Brown might have served for the same period. Smith might get a star and Brown might not, yet their characters might be considered equally good. The principle they had established in the public service was that not only was there to be no favouritism, but that there should not be even the appearance of it. Without voting against His Majesty's Government, he, however, considered that the system was extremely unsatisfactory.

Mr. LOUGH said he did not think the explanation of the hon. Gentleman was at all satisfactory; but as the hon. Gentleman was not familiar with the details he would not press the matter further at present. He would put down Questions, and if they were not satisfactorily answered he would raise the matter again on Report. The allowances referred to by his hon. friend were a very remarkable system of remuneration. Who settled the allowances, and on what principle were they given? Would the amount be continued from year to year? Last year the allowance for rummaging was only £410; this year that item had disappeared altogether.

Mr. VICTOR CAVENDISH said that the amount had been added to the item for allowances.

Mr. LOUGH said that in that case the new allowances were four times greater than the old. The hon. Gentleman ought to tell the Committee plainly on what theory the system was based. Would it not be better that the men should get a living wage and fair treatment rather than be starved for ten years?

Mr. WHITLEY said he thought the Financial Secretary had admitted his case because, in the answer he gave, the hon. Gentleman stated that these allowances were an increase of pay given to the men in this way. It practically came to this, that there were three classes of men employed, and he submitted that the proper way to deal with this matter was to put down the proper wage paid to each class. It was quite clear that these allowances were not the reward of merit, but simply a method of meeting the claims of the men for better remuneration. He held it was an objectionable method, and one which ought not to be adopted. How did the Financial Secretary propose to deal with the pensions of this star allowance class—the item of £1,500 was clearly only the beginning of it? It would increase from year to year as men came in. He proposed to divide the Committee, not as a protest against the men getting this extra money, but as a protest against these allowances, and as part of a systematic attempt to get all these items removed from the Estimates in order that the amount due to these men might appear in the Vote as "pay."

Sir EDWARD GREY (Northumberland, Berwick) asked for information as to the method by which these allowances for good conduct were awarded. Were they given in every case after a number of years service if no report for misconduct had been made, or were they given only in exceptional cases when an exceptional report for good conduct was presented?

Mr. VICTOR CAVENDISH said that the increase was given as a matter of course if there had been no report for misconduct. In future Estimates further details should be given. He would not go so far as to say that this item would in the future be dealt with as salary, but the suggestion of the hon. Member for Halifax should receive his sympathetic consideration.

Mr. WHITLEY said that on that assurance he should not divide the House on this reduction. He asked for information as to the sum of £3,000 for rewards for the capture of smugglers.

Mr. VICTOR CAVENDISH said with regard to the sum put down for rewards for the capture of smugglers, it was, of course, an estimate. The sum put down would no doubt cover the average amount paid each year.

Mr. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid) asked if the hon. Gentleman could give the amount paid for the capture of smugglers in the past year.

Mr. VICTOR CAVENDISH: No, sir, I have not the figures.

*Mr. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty) said the Committee ought to have some further explanation of this item. Smuggling in the Highlands and Islands of Scotland had greatly diminished, and no doubt the same thing had occurred in other parts. It was perfectly absurd to deal with a matter of this kind in this way. Because it cost £3,300 years ago for the capture of smugglers were they always to see these figures in the Estimates?

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES defended the Estimate of £3,300. As the Secretary to the Treasury had most properly said, sums of this kind were put down from an average. It was impossible to say what would have to be expended during the year and consequently a round sum had always been put down.

Lord EDMUND FITZMAURICE (Wiltshire, Cricklade) said that smuggling and the expenditure for the capture and detection of smugglers had gone on diminishing ever since the adoption of free trade, but it was perfectly certain that if the policy of the right hon. Member for Birmingham——

*The CHAIRMAN said it would not be in order to introduce the policy of the right hon. Member for West Birmingham into the discussion.

Lord EDMUND FITZMAURICE said he merely desired to point out that the answer of the hon. Gentleman amounted to another pledge on behalf of the Government that there would be no alteration of the fiscal policy of the country.

Mr. WHITLEY asked whether this amount was given to civilians or to the men in the service.

Mr. VICTOR CAVENDISH was unable to give any further information than appeared on the Estimates.

Mr. DALZIEL objected to the Motion being withdrawn. The simple point, he said, which had been under discussion for the last two years, was whether certain officials should be paid according to their merits or whether they were, after fifteen years service, to have allowances. The hon. Gentleman had said he would consider this matter in a sympathetic spirit, and everybody knew that that meant nothing. Either there was something or there was nothing in this complaint. The men themselves were totally and entirely dissatisfied, and it seemed to him that if this protest was to have any effect whatever the Committee ought not to be satisfied with the explanation of the hon. Member. With regard to the rewards given for the detection of smuggling, if civilians got the money the men in the service did not benefit from them, if, on the other hand, these rewards were given to the men in the service, then it ought to be considered in the general rate of pay.

Sir JOHN GORST (Cambridge University) said that he had had considerable experience of public Departments, and he could assure the Committee that the pledge given to the hon. Gentleman meant that this matter would be seriously considered; that all the Papers would be brought in; and that the officials of the Treasury, who had to deal with this matter, and his hon. friend would in all probability come to a conclusion satisfactory to all parties. He thought the hon. Member for Halifax was perfectly right to be satisfied with the assurance which had been given, and he hoped the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy Burghs would not persist in refusing to allow the Motion to be withdrawn.

Mr. DALZIEL said he only desired to ensure that this matter should be fully considered, and if the Secretary to the Treasury accepted the interpretation of the right hon. Member for Cambridge, he would not persist.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Original Question again proposed.

Mr. J. H. LEWIS called attention to the fact that the greater part of this particular Vote was accounted for by the increase in the Statistical staff, and asked for an explanation as to the nature of that increase.

MR. WEIR asked whether an item relating to an allowance of 4¾d. made in lieu of a ration of rum to the sailors on board the "Vigilant" might not now be allowed to disappear entirely from the Vote and the amount be added to the pay of the men. We were not in these days supposed to induce our sailors to drink rum, and, except in the case of the "Vigilant," the ration of rum had, he believed, disappeared.

Question put, and agreed to.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £1,355,100, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Inland Revenue Department."

MR. GEORGE WHITELEY (Yorkshire, W.R., Pudsey) said that he had put down a Motion for a reduction of the Vote by £100 in order to call attention to the unfair and unjust treatment—almost, as he considered, illegal treatment—meted out by the Inland Revenue authorities to small unregistered friendly societies whose total revenue was under £160 a year. Large registered friendly societies like the Manchester Unity of Oddfellows, which had accumulated a fund of £11,500,000 could take care of themselves. These large registered friendly societies were exempted from contribution on account of income-tax on their investments. In reply to a Question the Chancellor of the Exchequer had referred to these organisations as legal societies, and from that it might be inferred that those societies which were not registered were illegal societies. That, however, was not the case, for there was no obligation whatever, either moral or statutory, upon friendly societies to register themselves, and as a matter of fact they had just as much right to remain unregistered as those associations of people who amalgamated for one common object. A Committee of the House of Commons had reported that with regard to friendly societies there was no law which deprived the King's subjects of the right of amalgamation for their mutual benefit. It had been shown upon high authority that unregistered friendly societies were in no sense illegal and were regarded as partnerships or associations of individuals for a special purpose. In his own constituency the Court Victoria Lodge of the Independent Order of Foresters had an annual loss on the working of £79, or in other words, its receipts were £278 and its outgoings £357. This lodge had an income of £105 a year from invested funds, which gave it a balance on the right side, and yet this society was called upon to pay income-tax upon the £105 per annum which it received from invested funds. Another society, the Loyal Duke William, showed a deficit of £71 a year, its total receipts being £221, and the expenditure £292. This Society had an income of £122 from investments, and consequently it was £51 a year on the right side, and yet it was called upon to pay income-tax upon the £122 a year which it received from investments. There was a small society in Littleborough called the United Methodist Free Church Funeral Society, and its receipts from contributions amounted to £7 10s. per annum. Its outgoings were between £9 and £12 a year, but it possessed an income of £15 a year from investments, which made its total receipts £22 10s., and yet it was called upon to pay income-tax upon that £15 when its total gross receipts were only £22 10s. He thought these was a great injustice to this small unregistered friendly societies.

The use of the expression "bodies corporate or politic as well as individuals" in connection with exemption did not, he contended, limit the exemption, but extended it. Persons or individuals remained in the same position as they were before. Those words were introduced to allow the big fish with incomes over £160 a year to escape, and they were not intended to retain the small fish with less incomes in the net. These words, generally, were intended by Parliament to permit big societies with large revenues to escape the payment of income-tax, and they did not exclude small unregistered societies which had an income under £160 a year and which under the law were regarded as partnerships of individuals from whom they ought not to take away the right of exemption. He wished to know if the Secretary to the Treasury or the Solicitor-General could quote any section of the Act of Parliament which enabled the Inland Revenue official to charge any partnership undertaking or associations of individuals upon less incomes than £160 per annum. It was repugnant to common sense to believe that the law intended the Inland Revenue authorities to assess for income-tax the incomes of these small societies, which were associated for charitable purposes, and which possessed incomes from £10 to £15 a year. It might be said that these societies could get over the difficulty by registering themselves, but they did not want to take that course, because there was a great deal of red tapeism about registration which made them deal with their funds in a way which these unregistered societies did not wish to adopt. He did not think that the Act should be used to bring pressure to bear upon unregistered societies in this way. Consequently there was a great injustice and unfairness in the present practice. The Chancellor of the Exchequer said that in the case of small unregistered friendly societies exemption was allowed on the ground that they were established for charitable objects, and Inland Revenue authorities would be glad to consider such cases. He had brought instances before the notice of the authorities, and he was glad to say that exemptions had been allowed in those cases. This, however, raised a very big question, and either these payments of income-tax were legal or illegal. This was a most important matter, for there were thousands of these small and poor societies which could not afford to fight the Government. They ought to have their rights safeguarded by Parliament, and he hoped that the Chancellor of the Exchequer would see that there was a case to be inquired into by the Committee appointed to deal with income-tax matters.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That Item A (Salaries, Wages, and Allowances) be reduced by £100."—(*Mr. George Whiteley.*)

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.) said that if he had known the hon. Gentleman intended to refer to the matter he would have refreshed his memory on the facts. It was rather a complicated matter, requiring some knowledge of law, and it was difficult for a layman to discuss it when he had not had an opportunity of perusing the papers for some time. The hon. Gentleman's point appeared to be that there were a large number of societies in a similar position to that for which he had obtained exemption.

MR. GEORGE WHITELEY said his argument was that all such societies had a right to exemption, and that it ought not to be a matter of grace.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said that that was a matter on which he must take legal advice before giving an opinion; but he would look into the matter again and would inquire into the circumstances of the particular case to which reference had been made and wherein that case differed from others in which no relief was given.

MR. GEORGE WHITELEY said there would be no other opportunity of bringing up the matter this session, and there were hundreds of societies suffering injustice on account of the present method of procedure. If the right hon. Gentleman would give a pledge that the question could be brought up again, the discussion might be postponed.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said he could not without any notice pledge himself to a novel view of the law or an alteration in practice into which he had had no means of examining. He thought the hon. Gentleman would have no difficulty in raising the point in Committee on the Finance Bill.

MR. WALLACE (Perth) said the Solicitor-General was sitting on the Bench opposite, and he should like to ask whether the hon. and learned Gentleman agreed with the interpretation of the section given by the Chancellor of the Exchequer in reply to his hon. friend in regard to the exemption from income-tax of such societies as those referred to. The answer was that the exemption in favour of persons whose incomes did not exceed £160 a year was confined to individuals and did not extend to these small unregistered societies, where the income-tax was deducted beforehand. He ventured to say that such an opinion could not be maintained for a moment by anyone who had read the section. The words of the section were perfectly clear, but he admitted that there was very great difficulty in dealing with questions of law in this House. He understood that the true method was that an unregistered society might make its claim to exemption, and if the claim was rejected, they had the right to have the question decided in a Court of law. He agreed that it ought not to be a matter of grace extended to one society, and refused to another. A dispensing power of that description might be a very dangerous one in the hands of the Executive.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES said it was a little inconvenient to discuss a matter of this sort on the Estimates. The proper time to discuss it would be when the Finance Bill was in Committee. He had introduced a measure of that sort more than once, but it had not been accepted by the Government. He suggested that an Amendment moved to the Finance Bill in Committee would be the best method of either clearing up the obscurity of the law, or amending it if necessary; and as the Government had left themselves probably the shortest time on record for completing so much sessional work as they had undertaken, hon. Gentleman opposite would have all the better chance on that account of securing a favourable consideration of such an Amendment.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY (Somersetshire, S.) said he must protest against the suggestion of his hon. and learned friend the Member for Perth that the small unregistered friendly societies should be obliged to go to a Court of law to settle the question of the legality of the remission of income-tax in their favour. He urged that the Chancellor of the Exchequer should settle the matter by giving instructions to the Inland Revenue not to collect the income-tax from these small unregistered friendly societies. He knew that some people were prejudiced against small unregistered friendly societies. He was not at all anxious to defend them, and would like to see them all registered; but there were many, especially in the West of England, which were not registered from want of funds. Some of them were very old indeed and did not want to break with ancient associations; but many of them had, according to the Registrar, done exceedingly good work, and, on the merits of the case, these societies ought not to be called upon to pay income-tax.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said he quite agreed with the general statement of the case by the hon. and learned Member opposite, that the Board of Inland Revenue ought not to have a dispensing power which they could exercise arbitrarily at their own sweet will, or in accordance with the wishes of the Minister of the day. He thought it would be expedient if some strictly limited regulation should be laid down on sound general principles, and which would not be open to abuse. This was a legal question of great technical difficulty on which he was not competent to express an opinion; but he would undertake to look carefully into the matter, and be prepared before the Committee stage of the Finance Bill to inform the hon. Gentleman what course of procedure should be adopted. He agreed it was not desirable to put small societies to the trouble and expense of a law suit to settl this matter if it could be settled by the investigation of the Government.

Mr. GEORGE WHITELEY said after that statement by the right hon. Gentleman he would ask leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Original Question again proposed.

***Mr. CLAUDE HAY** said he wished to direct attention to the conditions of service of the outdoor officers of Excise, whose duties were far more responsible than the duties of the indoor staff, namely, of second division clerks. An outdoor officer could only reach a maximum of £250, whereas a member of the indoor staff could reach a maximum of £340. That was not to the advantage of the service, as could be seen from the evidence of Sir Algernon West, late Chairman of the Board of Inland Revenue, who said that the duties of the outdoor staff were more important than the duties of second division clerks. It was obvious when nine out of every ten officers were discontented that such a condition of affairs did not promote efficiency; and when it was considered that the work of these officers involved a great deal of tact and discretion, surely some recognition ought to be given to them. Moreover, any negligence or incompetence on their part would certainly result in loss to the revenue of the State. The subject was not a new one, although it had not been ventilated in the House. His hon. friend the Financial Secretary to the Treasury would, however, remember that two memorials had been presented to the Board of Inland Revenue and to the Treasury on the subject; and also that there had been a deputation of the officers affected to the Board of Inland Revenue, a second deputation having been refused. There had been no reconsideration of the case of those officers for many years, although their duties had in the meantime increased in amount and importance. He would move the reduction of the Vote by £200, as a protest against the action of the authorities in refusing, not an increase of pay, but an inquiry, when the evidence of such a very experienced permanent official as Sir Algernon West showed that those officers had a substantial case which merited investigation. It was constantly thrown in their teeth that they were demanding economy on the one hand, and advocating increased expenditure on the Civil Service on the other, because, forsooth, Civil servants brought pressure to bear on Members of the House of Commons. So far, however, as he was concerned he was not aware that a single officer of the class to which he was referring resided in his constituency. The subject was one which must have been under the consideration of the Financial Secretary; and he hoped that the hon. Gentleman would be able to state the decision at which he had arrived; and that he would consent to the reasonable demand of the officers by instituting an inquiry by an independent Commission into the conditions of their service. He did not press for a Parliamentary inquiry; but should suggest that the precedent of the Committee which had inquired into the condition of certain classes of postal officers should be followed. That Committee consisted of gentlemen of wide business experience; and a similar Committee should be appointed to consider the conditions of service of the outdoor officers of the Inland Revenue. They should then know if the demands of those officers were or were not justified. He begged to move.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Item A (Salaries, Wages, and Allowances) be reduced by £200."—(*Mr. Claude Hay.*)

*MR. WEIR said he wished to refer to one or two matters in connection with this Vote. On the 10th of the present month he asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer, as representing the Inland Revenue Department, what was the amount of the fines received in respect of people neglecting to take out dog licences, and what was the average amount of the fines. The reply of the right hon. Gentleman was that the records kept by the Inland Revenue Department could not supply the information. A more miserable reply he had never heard. He contended that the books of the Inland Revenue could not be kept properly, if indeed any were kept at all, in connection with these fines. The Committee were entitled to know what had become of all this money. What had the Chairman of the Inland Revenue Department done with it? He hoped some information would be forthcoming. He would also like to know what the Chairman of the Inland Revenue had done with a sum of several thousands of pounds obtained from the London and Westminster Bank, representing the difference collected in respect to income-tax between 11d. and 1s. 3d. in the £ on a £9,000,000 4 per cent. loan of the Cape Government. It was the duty of the Inland Revenue Office to return this money to the agent for the loan. We should know how much money was received by the Inland Revenue Department and not accounted for. He further asked that the Chairman of Inland Revenue should instruct surveyors of taxes in Scotland to take care that any returns which they were required to make as Assessors of Deer Forests should be accurate.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES drew attention to the administration of the Estate Duty Office, the changes in its constitution and working, and their disastrous effect on the future collection of revenue. This office collected a revenue of between £17,000,000 and £18,000,000 a year, and of late than revenue had been found to suffer a decrease. That decrease was largely due to the Finance Act of 1894, but to a certain extent it had been due to the changes in the working of the Estate Duty Office. A very considerable proportion of the estate duties arose from arrears, and the collection of these involved a considerable amount of work on the part of the Estate Duty Office. He supposed that there was no office in the service of the State which had performed its duty so well up to a few years ago as the Estate Duty Office. The office had worked the Finance Act of 1894 with very great success, but for some reason the Government had appointed a Committee, presided over by the right hon. Member for Haddingtonshire, to reorganise the office. The Committee's suggestions had upset the whole office, changed every officer's duties, and had generally altered a system which had succeeded well for a hundred years. A new system had been introduced, which was a complete failure, as was shown by the letters appearing in *The Times*, complaining of the time taken to deal with the most simple operations of the office. The new system had involved so much extra correspondence that a very great delay had occurred, he understood, in the collection of the duty. He wished to put the hon. Gentleman on his defence in regard to the new system which came into operation in January this year. Would the Secretary to the Treasury deny that this new system had been one of the most egregious and acknowledged failures that had ever occurred in a public office? At the present time he would content himself with making the broad statement that a very grave error had been committed in the reorganisation of this office where alterations in principle and not in detail had taken place. He was sorry that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Haddingtonshire was not in his place to explain the reasons why alterations which had been so disastrous to the work of the office had been made. Although the officials had done their best under the circumstances the new system had had a very serious effect upon the office itself. He asked the Treasury either to give up the new system and revert in principle to the old order of things or to grant another inquiry into the working of the present system.

MR. VICTOR CAVENDISH said he had not had the opportunity of going thoroughly into this question, but he had made most careful inquiries as to these complaints, and although there had necessarily been a certain amount of difficulty incurred in connection with the change there was no reason to believe that when the system was in working order it would not prove to be thoroughly satisfactory. He was told that the arrangements were very satisfactory at the present time. It had been necessary to make not only changes in the system, but structural alterations; and when the rearrangement was in working order there was no reason why the new system should not prove to be a success. If, however, the Government found that the system was not fulfilling the objects they had in view an attempt would be made to improve it to the best of their ability. As to the outdoor Excise officers, he pointed out that the work needed only a fair number of men who were in receipt of a moderate income and a small number of men for the superior work. In justice to the taxpayers, the Department could not employ men at a much higher rate of remuneration. As a class, the men were receiving the remuneration applicable to the work they had to perform. They were doubtless entitled to bring forward their case, but the matter had been considered again and again, and he could hold out no hope of any alteration being made. To accede to the demand would, in his opinion, be wrong economically, and he did not believe it would remove the difficulty which at present existed.

MR. J. H. LEWIS referred to a difficulty experienced by persons entitled to abatements from income-tax. He held that inasmuch as it was constantly stated that a graduated income-tax was impossible, the least the Government could do was to make it as little difficult as possible for persons to obtain the abatements to which they were entitled, and to recover the excess amounts they had paid. The predecessor of the present Secretary to the Treasury had initiated a policy which had been a great improvement on the previous state of affairs, and he asked whether it was proposed to continue that policy.

MR. VICTOR CAVENDISH: Certainly.

MR. J. H. LEWIS further asked whether the Government intended to introduce a Land Tax Commissioners Name Bill in the course of the present Parliament. The Land Tax Commissioners were the persons who appointed the Income Tax Commissioners, but these additional persons had not been appointed for a very long time. Moreover, it was practically under the discretion of the clerk to the Land Tax Commissioners whether these persons should be called together or not, and, as a matter of fact, they had not been called together as often as they ought to be. He hoped the hon. Gentleman would look into the matter with a view to seeing that the clerk apprised the Land Tax Commissioners of the meetings for the election of Commissioners of Income Tax.

MR. VICTOR CAVENDISH believed the Government contemplated bringing in such a Bill this session; possibly it would be laid on the Table in the course of a few days, and he hoped he would have the hon. Member's assistance in passing it into law.

MR. AINSWORTH (Argyll) complained that the income-tax was collected much more strictly and earlier in Scotland than in England. Inasmuch as the system of taxation was the same in the two countries it was only fair that the system of collection should be the same, and he urged the Secretary to the Treasury to give his attention to the matter. If the Treasury were not prepared to deal with the matter off-hand, he suggested that it might be referred to the Committee at present considering questions affecting the income-tax.

*MR. CLAUDE HAY expressed his astonishment at the reply of the Secretary to the Treasury with reference to the matter he had raised. Similar replies, however, were given when the grievances of postal servants were first brought forward, but an inquiry was subsequently granted, and he hoped a similar result would follow in the present case. He had no desire to press the matter to a division on that occasion; he asked leave to withdraw the Amendment.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Original Question again proposed.

*MR. WEIR complained that on the two questions he had raised no satisfactory information had been given. With regard to the excess income-tax paid to the Inland Revenue on account of the Cape Government 4 per cent. loan, the hon. Member merely said that the matter had been thoroughly threshed out, while the question of penalties inflicted on persons for keeping dogs without licences had been altogether ignored by him. That was not the way to advance business in the House; Members were entitled to get information on the points they raised He should be the last to stand in the way of hon. Members having a night off, but he could not be a party to any arrangement whereby Ministers would be able to evade dealing with the questions brought under their notice. He hoped the hon. Gentleman representing the Treasury would take steps to see that the money illegally retained by the Inland Revenue was returned to the agents for the loan.

MR. VICTOR CAVENDISH hoped the hon. Gentleman would not think there was any personal discourtesy in not dealing with the questions referred to. He was unable to add anything to the answers formerly given.

*MR. WEIR said the books were not properly kept, and that the business was conducted in a very unbusinesslike fashion. He would address further Questions to the hon. Gentleman, and he hoped he would get the information he desired.

Original Question put, and agreed to.

CLASS I.

3. £435,300 to complete the sum for Revenue Buildings.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £290,900, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, in respect of sundry Public Buildings in Great Britain not provided for on other Votes."

*MR. WEIR called attention to an item of £28,000 for new buildings for vaccination purposes, and was proceeding to complain of the lack of any information, when

SIR A. ACLAND-HOOD expressed his willingness to postpone the Vote.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Resolutions to be reported To-morrow; Committee also report Progress; to sit again To-morrow.

ADJOURNMENT.

Motion made, and Question, "That this House do now adjourn," (*Sir A. Acland-Hood*) put, and agreed to.

Adjourned at half after Seven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 1st *June*, 1904.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Chesterfield Corporation (Tramways and Improvements) Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

London United Tramways Bill; Middlesborough, Stockton-on-Tees, and Thornaby Tramways Bill. As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

London County Council (Tramways and Improvements) Bill (by Order). Consideration, as amended, deferred till Thursday, 9th June (Evening Sitting).

North British Railway (General Powers) Order Confirmation. Bill to confirm a Provisional Order, under The Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, relating to the North British Railway, ordered to be brought in by the Lord Advocate and Mr. A. Graham Murray.

North British Railway (General Powers) Order Confirmation Bill. "To confirm a Provisional Order, under The Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, relating to the North British Railway," presented accordingly; and ordered to be considered upon Friday.

Leith Corporation Tramways Order Confirmation. Bill to confirm a Provisional Order, under the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, relating to Leith Corporation Tramways, ordered to be brought in by the Lord Advocate and Mr. A. Graham Murray.

Leith Corporation Tramways Order Confirmation Bill. "To confirm a Provisional Order, under The Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland), Act, 1899, relating to Leith Corporation Tramways," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Thursday, 9th June, and to be printed. [Bill 209.]

Dundee, Broughty Ferry, and District Tramways Order Confirmation. Bill to confirm a Provisional Order, under The Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, relating to Dundee, Broughty Ferry, and District Tramways, ordered to be brought in by the Lord Advocate and Mr. A. Graham Murray.

Dundee, Broughty Ferry, and District Tramways Order Confirmation Bill. "To confirm a Provisional Order, under The Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, relating to Dundee, Broughty Ferry, and District Tramways," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Thursday, 9th June, and to be printed. [Bill 216.]

Leith Burgh Order Confirmation. Bill to confirm a Provisional Order, under The Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, relating to the Burgh of Leith, ordered to be brought in by the Lord Advocate and Mr. A. Graham Murray.

Leith Burgh Order Confirmation Bill. "To confirm a Provisional Order, under The Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, relating to the Burgh of Leith," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Thursday, 9th June, and to be printed. [Bill 217.]

Motherwell and Bellshill Railway (Abandonment) Order Confirmation. Bill to confirm a Provisional Order, under The Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, relating to Motherwell and Bellshill Railway (Abandonment), ordered to be brought in by the Lord Advocate and Mr. A. Graham Murray.

Motherwell and Bellshill Railway (Abandonment) Order Confirmation Bill. "To confirm a Provisional Order, under The Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, relating to Motherwell and Bellshill Railway (Abandonment)," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Thursday, 9th June, and to be printed. [Bill 218.]

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions for alteration; from Forres; University of Edinburgh; and Lerwick; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Campsie, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

FRANCHISE AND REMOVAL OF WOMEN'S DISABILITIES (No. 2) BILL.

Petition from Bermondsey, against; to lie upon the Table.

HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES, ETC., BILL.

Petitions against; from Bradford; and Portsmouth; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions against; from Chesterfield; New Southgate; Ponder's End; Crawley; Vauxhall; Bristol (three); Durdham Down; Redland; Ellesmere; Pye Bank; Leeds (two); Dunoon; Sandbank; Winchmore Hill (four); Pentre; Carnoustie (two); Tollerton; Argyll; Stanton Prior; Chelsea; Cheddar (three); Wells; Ardrossan; Fairlie; Bridport (two); West Bristol (two); Edinburgh (two); Walkden and Little Hulton; Woodley; South and East Lancashire; Plasmare; Swindon; Neath; Brynhyfryd; Loughor; Stoke Newington; Alvaston; Birstall (three); Howden Clough; Marple; Bishopston (two); Gomersal; Perth (two); St. Lawrence; Aberdeen; Bonnybridge; Bridge of Allan; Limerigg; Stirlingshire; Shipley (two); Wibsey; Leven (two); Thurso; Largs; Ashby de la Zouch; Heckmondwike; Slamannan; Harrington; Porteslam; Ledbury; Catrin; Girvan; Annbank; Benquhat; Fortrose; Wigan; South West Lancashire; Northampton; New Trimdon; Hexham; Aston; Paisley; Renfrew (two); Port Glasgow; Dumbarton; Howard Park; Kilmarnock; Skelmanthorpe; Edzell; Brixton; Sileby; Leigh; Shiregreen; North Finchley; Stepney; Gloucester; East London; Bush Hill Park; West Hartlepool; Hanham; Birkenshaw (two); Rawtenstall (two); Bacup; Clowbridge; Dundee; Derby; Leyton (two); Inverness; Forest Hill; Walthamstow (two); New Malden (two); Farnworth; Walkden; Bury (nineteen); Elton; Holywell; Top-y-Rhos; Woolfold; Leuchars; Ladybank; Letham; Glossop; Worcester; Lewisham; Lamberhead Green; Salford; Stockport; Oldham (two); Royton (two); Holm East; Longhope; Stennes; Barnoldswick; Evesham; Westcliffe-on-Sea; Rayleigh; Southend-on-Sea; Bewdley; Lower Broughton; Canning Town (two); Newburn-on-Tyne; Maescar; Ystradgynlais (two); Mynydd Troedd; Sunnybridge; Rishton; Bala (two); Dolgelly; Llanfachreth; Corris; Slingsby; North Walbottle; Benwell (five); Wallsend; Sileby; Leicestershire; Stockport; Littleton; Oxfordshire; Newcastle-upon-Tyne; Scotswood-on-Tyne; Willington Quay; Cottenham; Llandeiful; Corwen; Brithdir; Twrog; Sansome Walk; Cannock; Ibstock (two); Portwood; Burghead; Odiham; Ellenabeich; Basingstoke (two); Tavistock; Hertfordshire; London; Evesham; Merioneth; St. Leonards (two); Bexhill (three); Putney; Dartford; Smallbridge; and Rochdale; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions for alteration; from Grangemouth; and Worcester; to lie upon the Table.

LOCAL AUTHORITIES (QUALIFICATION OF WOMEN) BILL.

Petition from Bermondsey, against; to lie upon the Table.

RE-VACCINATION BILL.

Petition from Stepney, against; to lie upon the Table.

TUBERCULOSIS (ANIMALS) COMPENSATION BILL.

Petition from Aberdeen, against; to lie upon the Table.

VALUATION BILL.

Petitions against; from Brecknock; King's Lynn; and Rotherham; to lie upon the Table.

VALUATION BILL.

Petitions for alteration; from Headington; Haslingden; Hexham; Tynemouth; Settle; Bealy; Loughborough; and Great Yarmouth; to lie upon the Table.

VOLUNTARY SCHOOLS ACT, 1897.

Petition from Leeds, for alteration of Law; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

LABOURERS' COTTAGES (IRELAND).

Return [presented 31st May] to be printed. [No. 188.]

POLLING DISTRICTS (COUNTY OF WARWICK).

Copy presented, of Order made by the County Council of the county of Warwick altering certain Polling Districts in the county [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Report of the Intermediate Education Board for Ireland for the year 1903 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

ARMY (MEDICAL DEPARTMENT).

Copy presented, of Report for the year 1902 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

NATIONAL SCHOOL TEACHERS' (IRELAND) PENSION FUND.

Annual Accounts presented, of Receipts and Payments for the year ended 31st December, 1903 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND).

Copy presented, of Thirty-first Annual Report by the Accountant for Scotland to the Scotch Education Department [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 7) BILL.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 19th May; *Mr. Bonar Law*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 189.]

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 8) BILL.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 19th May; *Mr. Bonar Law*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 190.]

SUGAR CONVENTION (COMMERCIAL, No. 5, 1904).

Copy presented, of further Findings of the Permanent Commission established under Article VII. of the Sugar Convention of 5th March, 1902, and further Reports of the British Delegate [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, No. 3176 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (MISCELLANEOUS SERIES).

Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Miscellaneous Series, Nos. 610 and 611 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Address for "Return showing separately, as regards (1) Publicans' Licences, excluding Hotel Licences, (2) Beerhouse (including Beer and Wine) Licences, and (3) Hotel Licences, the number of Licences within each grade of the Schedule to the Licensing Bill of the present Session, and the maximum amount payable under the Bill in respect of the Licences within each grade in every county and county borough in England and Wales."—(*Mr. Cochrane.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Indebtedness of Borough Councils.

MR. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he will give the grand totals of columns 1 to 11, inclusive, for England and Wales respectively of Return No. 114, of Session 1904 (Indebtedness of Boroughs).

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) The total number of boroughs mentioned in column 1 of the Return is 319. The totals of the sums in columns 2 to 11 are as follows—

	£
Column 2 (outstanding loans in respect of water works, gas works, etc.) - -	114,310,427
Column 3 (outstanding loans in respect of other works and purposes) - - -	80,700,022
Column 4 (overdrafts on bankers on capital account) - - - -	7,233,548
Column 5 (overdraft on bankers on revenue account) - - - -	3,479,505
Column 6 (total of outstanding loans and overdrafts)	205,731,307
Column 7 (amount standing to credit of sinking funds)	11,960,956
Column 8 (amount remaining due to the councils in respect of loans raised to advance to other local authorities) - - -	2,987,880
Column 9 (estimated value of corporate property) - -	241,135,270
Column 10 (assessable value for purposes of the borough rate) - - -	64,798,316
Column 11 (assessable value for purposes of the general district rate) - - -	61,409,825

In connection with the total amounts in columns 4 and 5, the observations in the fourth paragraph of the Memorandum prefixed to the Return should be borne in mind, and as regards the amounts stated in column 9 attention may be drawn to the remarks in column 12.

Compulsory Retirement of War Office Clerks.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE (Wexford, N.): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he will state how many out of the 600 writers promoted to the Abstractor Class when over the age of fifty years were gazetted to the War Office, and how many of these clerks actually forfeited £100 gratuity on such promotion; how many of the established abstractor clerks in the War Office have been called upon to accept retirement at the age of sixty years, while efficient and with less than forty years of service; and whether such compulsory retirement at sixty benefited the Imperial Exchequer at the expense of these established Civil Service clerks.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) Three abstractors when over the age of fifty were posted to the War Office, all of whom would have been eligible for the gratuity of £100, in lieu of which they became eligible for pension. One of them was called upon to retire. The Imperial Exchequer did not benefit pecuniarily thereby except for a few years.

Proposed Vandalism at Berwick-on-Tweed.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.): To ask the hon. Member for Chorley, as representing the First Commissioner of Works, whether the attention of His Majesty's Government has been called to the proposal made to destroy some of the best preserved parts of the extremely interesting ancient walls (dating from the time of King Edward I.) of the town of Berwick-upon-Tweed; and whether they will take any such steps as may lie within their power to endeavour to secure the preservation of this almost unique historical monument.

(*Answered by Lord Balcarres.*) The First Commissioner has been in communication with the municipal authorities and hopes to arrive at an arrangement with them for the preservation of the walls in question.

Bank of Ireland—Balances under the Land Purchase Act, 1903.

MR. WILLIAM ABRAHAM (Cork County, N.E.): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether the Treasury have made any estimate of the large balances that will periodically lie in the hands of the Bank of Ireland under the operation of The Irish Land Purchase Act, 1903; and whether it is proposed to require that bank to pay interest upon the same.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) No estimate has been made of any such balances, if there are any, or could be made, until more experience has been gained of the working of the Act. It therefore seems premature to contemplate making any special arrangements with the Bank of Ireland.

Income-Tax in respect of Emoluments of Schoolmasters.

COLONEL LOCKWOOD (Essex, Epping): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether his attention has been called to the judgment in the case of Smyth *v.* Stretton, and to the irregularity of the payments made on assessments under Schedule E of the Income Tax Acts in respect of the emoluments of schoolmasters and assistant schoolmasters; and, if so, whether steps will be taken to secure uniformity in this matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) I have carefully considered this case since my attention was called to it by my hon. and gallant friend's Question. The regularity of the assessments made under Schedule E on the increases of salary granted by the Governors of Dulwich College under the Provident Fund Scheme of the College was upheld by the judgment of the Court in the case of Smyth *v.* Stretton, and I see no sufficient reason for proposing a change in the law. It is not possible to secure absolute uniformity in such a matter, as the cases present an infinite variety of circumstances; but, whenever the circumstances are the same, the treatment will be the same.

Naval Expenditure of France, Germany, and Russia.

MR. RUNCIMAN (Dewsbury): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he can state what has been the total naval expenditure out of revenue or out of capital, apart from special war expenditure, of France, Germany, and Russia, respectively, for each of the past twenty-five years.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) I have no data which would enable me to give the information desired by the hon. Member.

The Archbishopric of Cyprus.

MR. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is now able to communicate to the House the result of the friendly intervention of the High Commissioner of Cyprus in connection with the vacant Archbishopric of Cyprus; and what steps, if any, have been taken to nominate a successor to the late Bishop of Paphos.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Lyttelton.*) I regret to inform the hon. Member that the offer of the High Commissioner's good offices has had no satisfactory result, and that he reports that it would be difficult to intervene in any way without wounding the consciences of either one party or the other. A successor to the late Bishop of Paphos was nominated in 1901, but the validity of the nomination was disputed, and no consecration has taken place.

The Free Food Motion—Facilities for resuming Debate.

MR. HEYWOOD JOHNSTONE (Sussex, Horsham): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he will afford facilities for the resumption of the debate of 18th May on Free Food adjourned on the Motion of the Leader of the Opposition.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) As my hon. friend is aware from the speech I made in debate it does not appear to me expedient that, in addition to the days already occupied by discussions on the fiscal question, more time should be expended in the course of the present session in debating a matter which is not to be dealt with by this Parliament. Under the circumstances it would not seem wise to allot days, urgently required for other business, to continuing the debate of 18th May.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

The New Army Scheme.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER (Staffordshire, Lichfield): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can give this House some pledge that nothing will be done to reduce the Auxiliary Forces or to introduce other drastic Army reform before the whole scheme of alteration has been discussed in this House and the sufficiency of the consequent reduction of expenditure considered.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): No changes will be made in the organisation and composition of the Army until the outlines of the whole scheme of the Government are in the possession of the House.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER: Does that apply to the Auxiliary Forces?

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: Clearly. The Auxiliary Forces are part of the Army.

DEAN FOREST BILL.

Ordered, That the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills do examine the Dean Forest Bill with respect to compliance with the Standing Orders relative to Private Bills.—(*Mr. Victor Cavendish.*)

THE ANGLO-FRENCH CONVENTION BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order for the Second Reading read.

*THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Earl PERCY, Kensington, S.): The object of the Bill to which we ask the House to give a Second Reading this afternoon is to obtain the assent of Parliament to a monetary indemnity and to certain cessions of British territory which are necessary in order to carry out the provisions of the Agreement recently concluded between the British and French Governments. The text of that Agreement has been for some time in the hands of the House; they are therefore aware of its provisions, and I should be wearying the House if I were to recapitulate them in detail now. But it is advisable to remind hon. Members that the proposals of the present Bill are only to be explained or defended in the light of the larger issues of policy embodied in the general Agreement; and it is presumably with those larger issues of policy rather than with the details of this measure that our debate will be principally concerned.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.): A discussion on anything in the Agreement will, I take it, be in order.

*EARL PERCY: Yes, I understand so. The House will remember that the general Agreement consists of three separate documents. The first of them relates to Egypt and Morocco. By that document the two Powers agree to recognise Egypt and Morocco as falling respectively within the sphere of paramount influence of Great Britain and France. At the same time, it guarantees for a period of at least thirty years, and independently of any political changes which may supervene in the interval, the principle in both those countries of absolute commercial freedom and equality of opportunity. It also secures for an unlimited period the principle of the free navigation of the Suez Canal and the Straits of Gibraltar, and the non-fortification of a large part of the Mediterranean and Atlantic sea-board of Morocco, between Melilla on the North-east and the heights above the River Sebou on the South-west.

The second of these documents relates entirely to Newfoundland. Under that convention France surrenders the privileges which she has hitherto enjoyed in virtue of the provisions of the Treaty of Utrecht. In return she obtains from this country a monetary indemnity — the amount of which remains to be determined, but which will certainly not be considerable in any case — for the forfeiture of the private rights of those who have hitherto been engaged in the French fishing industry on the treaty shore. In the second place, France obtains territorial compensation for the sacrifice of public rights; and that territorial compensation is found in three separate cessions of territory on the West Coast of Africa. We give up a small group of islands—the Iles de Los—opposite Konakry, the capital of the French colony of Guinea. The Iles de Los were originally ceded to this country by the king of the Bago country in 1818; and they were retained in the possession of this country in 1882, when we ceded to France the greater part of the mainland. Under the Agreement we give up these islands, which have lost the importance for us that they had formerly. It was on these islands originally that the principal British trading stations were placed, but the warehouses have now been transferred to the mainland. In the second place we agree to the extension of the French colony of Senegambia, so as to include in French territory Yarbutenda or "The Strangers' Wharf," which is merely a landing stage containing no population but a few huts that are removed in the rainy season. The history of the French position on the Gambia may be briefly described. In 1857 we gave to the French the right of free access for her ships and commerce to the Gambia River; and subsequently in 1889 an arrangement was come to by which a strip, ten kilometres wide on each bank of the lower portion of the river, was reserved for Great Britain, while the upper waters were reserved for France. It so happens that the stretch of river navigable for ships drawing as much as ten feet of water ceases at the rapids, a few miles to the north of Yarbutenda. Therefore, under the old arrangement, the French have been absolutely excluded from the navigable portion of the river; and it is that disability which is removed by this new Agreement. In the third place, we agree to a readjustment of the boundaries between British and French Nigeria, which will give to the French a considerable accession of territory — some 14,000 square miles—and above all, what they attach most importance to, and what they have never had — uninterrupted access from their territories on the bank of the Niger to their territories on the eastern and southern shores of Lake Chad.

The third document which is included in this Agreement contains a general readjustment of the interests of Great Britain and France in those parts of the world which lie to the east of the African Continent. In Siam, France recognises as falling within the British sphere of influence the territories to the west and south-west of the basin of the River Menam, and we recognise as falling within the French sphere the territories to the east and south-east of the same region. In Madagascar we give up a protest founded, after all, on a disputed point of international law against the exclusive commercial *régime* which was instituted in the island by the French Government when they converted their protectorate into annexation. On the other hand, in return the French surrender the extra territorial rights which they have hitherto exercised in the island of Zanzibar; and in the Pacific the two countries agree to take concerted measures for a settlement of disputed land claims and for the establishment of jurisdiction over the natives of the New Hebrides where no provision for it previously existed. The House will see that it is only under the second of these documents—the convention which relates to Newfoundland—that any surrender of rights or privileges or any territorial cession by this country is involved. It is, therefore, only with the convention that this Bill deals, and it is only in connection with the convention that the opportunity for legislation arises. I say "opportunity" advisedly, because the question whether such legislation is necessary or not is not, I think, at issue on the present occasion. By inserting in the preamble of that convention the provision that it is only signed subject to the assent of Parliament, the Crown, in the exercise of its discretion, signifies its desire to obtain that assent, not merely to the monetary indemnity, for which, of course, the consent of the House of Commons would be necessary, and not merely to the cession of territory, in regard to which the practice of consulting Parliament has varied widely from time to time, but also to all the other provisions in the convention for which there is obviously no constitutional obligation to obtain our approval.

Before entering into discussion of the Agreement itself I may notice one or two criticisms which have already appeared in some quarters and may possibly be repeated by some of the speakers to-night. We may be told, for instance, that there are still certain outstanding points of controversy which are left unsettled by this Agreement; and that, therefore, it cannot be said to be a complete and final solution of all the disputes which have arisen between the two countries. That is perfectly true, but it is not, I think, a very serious criticism. It is obvious that even if it were not true, and this Agreement had removed from the sphere of controversy all the questions pending between the two Governments, there would have been no guarantee in that fact against the recurrence of similar small disputes in the future—

disputes which are inevitable between two great conterminous and colonising Powers. But this Agreement does remove from the sphere of controversy all the questions which have occasioned the greatest difficulty and friction in the past, and therefore it will considerably facilitate the task of diplomacy in disposing of the minor differences which remain to be settled. One of the few outstanding subjects of dispute between the two Governments—the question of the compensation of British companies in the French Congo—is at all events in a fair way to a settlement. There is no difference in principle between the view we take and that which the French Government take; they admit that under the terms of the concession to the French companies they are bound to come to an equitable arrangement with the British companies which have been expropriated, and they have promised to do all they can to promote such an arrangement.

And now I pass to another form of criticism, concerning not so much the provisions of the Agreement as our mode of procedure in concluding it. It has been said, I think by the hon. Member for King's Lynn, that we have come to an arrangement with France affecting certain countries like Siam and Morocco without previous consultation with the Governments concerned. Well, there is no reason that I can see why either of those Governments should have been consulted in the matter. This Agreement does not alter or impair the validity of any existing arrangements to which we are a party and which affect those countries. On the contrary, it confirms them. Under this Agreement both we and the French reassert our interest in the integrity of Siam and in the political *status* of Morocco. If we go further and define the area within which, and the conditions under which, subject to those limitations, the influence of the two countries is to be exercised in Morocco and Siam, I think it must be patent to the mind of my hon. friend that our right to disinterest ourselves in any portion of those territories is an absolute right which concerns ourselves alone and for which we do not require the consent of their Governments. While, on the other hand, the extent to which we or the French are able to make our influence felt in the future in the areas recognised as falling within our spheres of influence will depend after this Agreement has been signed, just as it depended before, on the assent and acquiescence of the native rulers.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): Do I understand the noble Lord to say that there is in this Agreement a reaffirmation of the integrity and independence of Siam? I cannot find it.

*****EARL PERCY**: I should have thought that it was stated on the surface of the Agreement that the two Powers do recognise the integrity of Siam and the political *status* of Morocco. The Sultan of Morocco will certainly gain prestige and relief from the financial embarrassments which have beset him in the past, by relying on the support and advice of France; and I am unable to see that either Siam or Morocco can derive anything but benefit from an Agreement which ensures that whenever they do wish to apply in the future for European counsel and assistance, they will not at all events find themselves trammelled and hampered by divided counsels and conflicting ambitions. The case of Spain is somewhat different. We have all along recognised that no arrangement between ourselves and the French in regard to Morocco would be tolerable which did not take into account the undoubted rights and claims of Spain in that country; and we have only signed the Agreement on the understanding that a corresponding arrangement should be come to between the French and Spanish Governments, and that that arrangement should be communicated to ourselves. Had we adopted any other course, had we made an Agreement between France and Spain a condition precedent to any arrangement between the French and ourselves, had we insisted on dragging the Spanish Government in as a third party to all these long and complicated negotiations, I think it will be obvious to every one that, with the best will in the world, those negotiations might never have reached a successful issue. That that would have been a great misfortune to this country and to France every one will admit; but I think the misfortune to Spain would possibly have been even greater. The situation of affairs in Morocco was such at the time the Agreement was drawn up that at any moment we might have found ourselves confronted with a condition of anarchy in that country in which the presumptive rights of international claimants would have had to give way to the paramount necessity of preserving by the readiest means available, and irrespective of any ulterior considerations, security for life and property.

Then I pass to the question of the Suez Canal Convention. I think my hon. friend the Member for King's Lynn takes the view that we and the French Government have arrogated to ourselves the right to modify in concert an international instrument to which eight other Powers were parties. We have done nothing of the kind. Article 6 of the declaration which relates to the Suez Canal Convention does not impair, on the contrary, it gives its sanction, and, in fact, new vitality, to the existing arrangement. In point of fact the Suez Canal Convention was never put into effective operation at all, because at the time that it was first drawn up in 1885 a reservation was made by Sir Julian Pauncefote which was repeated by Lord Salisbury two years later, when the convention was communicated to the other European Powers, to the effect that we appended our signature on the understanding that we assented to its provisions only in so far as they were compatible with the existing state of affairs in Egypt, and did not hamper our liberty of action in that country. That reservation was not objected to by any of the other Powers to whom the document was communicated, and it was with a full knowledge of that reservation that they ratified the convention. But, although they raised no protest against that reservation, they have in fact regarded it, and one Power at all events has explicitly interpreted it, as throwing doubt on our acceptance of the principles of that convention as a whole. That was never our intention; and it was long the wish of the late Lord Salisbury to seize the first favourable opportunity of clearing up the misunderstanding and regularising the position. That is precisely what we have now done. We have reaffirmed our acceptance of that convention as embodying the principles and methods by which the free navigation of the Suez Canal is secured. We have explicitly stated what is the meaning we attach to our reservation of 1885; and we have obtained the assent of France to the proposition that we have acted and shall be acting loyally to the obligations which we undertook in 1885 if we continue to observe the principles so laid down. Considering the prominent part which France has played in the creation of that great international waterway I do not think it is surprising that we should have selected her as the first confidante of our intentions in regard to it; and there is no reason whatever to suppose that the recognition which she has given of our loyalty to the obligations we have undertaken will be withheld by any of the other Powers whom we have asked to take note of them.

Now I come to the last class of criticism which, perhaps, it is necessary to notice. It may be said that an objection to this Agreement, or the main objection to it, is that the advantages which France gains from it are greater than the advnatages which are gained by this country. Well, I do not take that view, and I think it would be very easy to prove the contrary. But I am not in the least anxious to demonstrate that we have driven a hard bargain with the French, and I should be very sorry to think that the French had got the worst of it. The desire of both parties to these negotiations throughout the whole of our discussion has been to see not how little we could concede to one another, but how far we could meet one another's views. If we have been able, as, I think, on the whole we have, to meet the French in regard to most of but not all the points to which they attach importance, I am very glad that we have been able to do so; and if, on the other hand, we have given up very little that was of value to ourselves and at the same time have obtained a great deal which we have long attempted to secure, then I think we have no reason to complain of the advantage we derive from the arrangement.

What are the advantages which this country gains? Let us take the declaration affecting Egypt and Morocco first. Under that declaration we give up absolutely nothing that we possess already. On the contrary, even in Morocco, where we seem to be making the most considerable sacrifices, we are, in fact, substantial gainers. The only rights and privileges which we possess at the present moment in Morocco are rights and privileges affecting our commerce and our shipping. Those privileges we retain under this Agreement—[An hon. MEMBER: For thirty years.] Yes, for thirty years—in return for corresponding concessions in Egypt; and those rights and privileges in Morocco will, of course, become more and more valuable with the progressive development under French auspices of the resources of that country. It may be of interest to remind the House in this connection of our experience in regard to the arrangement we made with France at the time they assumed the Regency of Tunis. I looked at the figures the other day, and I find that since that date the commerce of this country with Tunis, both imports and exports, has increased by leaps and bounds; yet, although under that arrangement we did obtain most-favoured-nation treatment for our goods, it was explicitly stated on the face of that instrument that most-favoured-nation treatment was not to entitle our goods to the same treatment as the goods of France. Considering, therefore, the far more liberal provisions of the present Agreement in regard to Morocco, I think we may legitimately hope that our trade with Morocco will derive a proportionately greater advantage. Then the only political interests we can be said to possess in Morocco that I am aware of are interests of a strategical character; and those are certainly rendered more and not less secure from the fact that for the future we have placed the principles of the non-fortification of the seaboard and the free navigation of the Straits under the dual guarantee of the two foremost commercial and maritime Powers of Europe.

Well, as I have said, we give up nothing; on the contrary, we gain a great deal in Morocco. But if we turn to Egypt we find that France is making a considerable sacrifice. She is giving up the right of financial and administrative control which she has exercised as long as, and in fact longer than, we have exercised any influence in that country ourselves. She not only abandons all right to interfere in the administration of Egypt in future, but she pledges herself, in what I think we shall recognise as a spirit of generous self-effacement, to act as our coadjutor and ally in a sphere in which she has herself been in the past no mean pioneer. She also pledges herself that at no future period will she ask that a time limit should be put to the splendid constructive and creative work which it has fallen to the lot of this country to undertake in the valley of the Nile. It will not be out of place to allude very briefly to the advantages which Egypt gains under this arrangement. It would be an entire mistake to suppose that those advantages, although inextricably mixed up with finance, are wholly of a financial character. Everyone who has studied the system which has grown up in Egypt under the capitulations and the various international conventions will be aware that that system ties the hands of the Egyptian Government in regard to every item and detail of her administration. They may not alter any of the taxes which are assigned to the service of the debt without the consent of the Powers; they may not alter any taxes which are not so assigned, if such an alteration is calculated to lead to a deficiency, without raising extra taxation to double the amount necessary to supply the deficiency. If they wish to embark on capital expenditure they may not raise a loan without the consent of the Powers; and if they do raise a loan, they may not, without that consent, charge the annuity to their authorised expenditure. In regard to their debt, they are obliged every year to set apart half of their annual surplus towards paying off that debt, not in the most economical way by drawings at par, but by the provision of an extravagant form of sinking fund by purchases of their own Government stock in the open market, naturally at prices often above par. Lastly, if they convert their own debt, they *ipso facto* lose all control themselves over the economies thereby effected. What is the result of that system to Egypt? The obvious result is that she has locked up a large amount of revenue, amounting to £5,500,000, the conversion economies, and, I think, £967,000, which is the unpledged portion of the general reserve fund, which she may not use for the purpose of developing her own resources. She would have locked up a great deal more but for the fact that the Powers during the past few years have adopted a more liberal policy in allowing grants for such purposes from the general reserve fund; and, indeed, they had less incentive to refuse it, because under the convention they were not allowed to accumulate a sum of more than £2,000,000 in the general reserve fund, but any accumulation in excess of that figure would have gone to swell the sinking fund in the same way as the conversion economies. But the control of the Powers over the general reserve fund is itself limited. The House will remember that in 1897 the Egyptian Government wished to defray part of the military expenditure in the Soudan out of the accumulations in the general reserve fund and obtained the consent of a majority of the Caisse to that allocation. The matter was subsequently brought up in the Appeal Court, and that Court decided that the Commissioners had acted *ultra vires* in giving their assent. The less obvious, but far more serious, result of this system to Egypt is that it throws on the existing generation of taxpayers a vast amount of expenditure which is ordinarily charged in other countries to capital account. The whole of the expenditure necessary to abolish the *corvée*, the system of compulsory labour, and the greater part of the expenditure necessary to effect a reduction of the land tax has been met out of annual revenue. Perhaps it may be said that this was only reasonable, because the existing taxpayers get the principal benefit from the change; But that is not the case with regard to expenditure, for instance, upon irrigation. In this year alone, of the portion of the general reserve fund, amounting to over £1,700,000, which is already pledged to various forms of expenditure, fully one-third is pledged to capital expenditure upon irrigation. Lord Cromer, in his last Report, estimated that during the last eighteen years no less than £10,000,000 had been spent in the same way for the benefit mainly of future generations of taxpayers, the whole of the cost of which has fallen on the shoulders of the present generation. What is true of irrigation is equally true of the railways. Lord Cromer's view at the present moment is that the most crying need of Egypt for the next few years will be an expenditure of something like £3,000,000 on railway construction—that that expenditure is even more urgently required than any expenditure upon irrigation. Yet under the provisions of the Law of Liquidation only 45 per cent. of the net profits of the railway administration is allowed to go to meet working expenses, a sum barely sufficient even for that purpose, and no adequate provision is made for capital expenditure on rolling-stock and the like. The whole of that expenditure, again, has to be borne by the present generation of taxpayers, and at the present moment the whole of the special reserve fund, amounting to £1,750,000, is pledged for the future construction of the Suakim-Berber Railway.

The House will see from this somewhat dull enumeration of financial points that what Egypt really gains by this Agreement is not merely the control of the greater part of her own taxes by the substitution of a single land tax for all the various taxes which have hitherto been assigned to the service of the debt, not merely the control of revenues amounting to between £6,000,000 and £7,000,000 now locked up, not merely the power to pay off her debt in the most economical manner, but also the priceless advantage of being able to meet calls for extraordinary capital and remunerative expenditure without charging the whole of that expenditure to annual revenue. She gets rid at once of the mixed administrations of the Port of Alexandria and of the railways and telegraphs; and the Caisse de la Dette itself, whose functions, while it survives, will be strictly limited to securing the punctual payment of the coupons will cease to exist as soon as the debt is redeemed. It may be said that all these advantages are contingent upon the acceptance by the other European Powers of these arrangements, to which France has given her assent. That is not quite the case.

Egypt has always claimed the right to pay off her debt at any time after 1905, and the Khedivial decree embodied in this Agreement represents a concession on her part which, of course, she is free to reconsider if her offer is not accepted. But I may repeat what I said in regard to the Suez Canal Convention, that we have no reason to anticipate that any difficulties will be raised by the other Powers. Their connection with Egypt has been historically far shorter in duration and far less intimate than the connection of France. Without going into ancient history, France was associated with us in the dual control as early as 1878. Italy and Austria were not even represented on the Caisse de la Dette until 1880, under the Law of Liquidation; and Germany and Russia had no representatives on that body till 1885. None of the other Powers are represented at all, as France is, upon the mixed administrations. As regards the proportions in which the debt is held, I find that 90 per cent. is held at the present moment in London and Paris, 9¾ per cent. in Egypt, and only ¼ per cent. in Berlin.

I will say one or two words with regard to the convention which relates to Newfoundland. What we give up under that convention I have already explained. We give up a few strips of territory, no doubt of considerable extent, but of no considerable value to ourselves, of which I think few people in this country had even heard, and which are of very great value, both practical and sentimental, to France. What do we gain? We gain in Newfoundland the abolition of the system under which our right to fish in the territorial waters of a portion of our own coast was enjoyed in strict subordination to the fishery rights of the French. Henceforth we are free to fish in those territorial waters as we please. We have an absolute monopoly of the fishing rights within the mouths of the rivers; we are free to draw up any regulations we please with regard to the seasons at which, and the conditions under which, the fisheries shall be carried on. Lastly, and this is the most important of all, we get rid of the system of dual ownership of the actual soil of Newfoundland, a system which, in Newfoundland, as in other countries nearer home, has proved incompatible with the application of capital or the development of a country's resources; and henceforward we are absolute masters of every inch of the soil of Newfoundland, with full liberty to apply our capital and develop its mining and other resources as we please. Only two obligations are imposed on the colonists. They are obligations of a kind which I think might well have been conceded out of mere feelings of neighbourliness and good fellowship. The colonists must allow the French to participate equally with themselves in the fishery of the territorial waters on the old treaty coast, where, I may remind the House, the citizens of the United States obtained the right of fishing themselves under the Treaty of Washington in 1871. They are also under an obligation to allow the sale of bait to the French on the treaty shore. It may be said, and I think said with some force, that a more satisfactory arrangement would possibly have been one under which the French would have had an absolute and unrestricted right to purchase bait wherever they liked in Newfoundland, and in return would have surrendered the artificial stimulus which their fisheries derive from the system of bounties. It was these bounties and the unfair advantage which they gave to French produce in the markets of the Mediterranean, and not any jealousy of the French fisheries as such, which led the Newfoundland Government some years ago to pass the Bait Act, forbidding the sale of bait to the French. They passed that Act mainly as a lever to secure the removal of the bounties. The Act did not have that effect, and, whatever injury may have been inflicted on the French fisheries, in itself hardly a matter for congratulation, the measure has inflicted far greater injury on the population of the southern shore, where the principal bait fisheries are situated. They used formerly to obtain a considerable livelihood—I think the amount was £30,000 to £50,000 a year—from the sale of bait on this shore, and that source of livelihood they lost under the operation of the Bait Act. That Act was repealed a few years later and a new system instituted under which the French obtained

Earl Percy.

the right to purchase bait on payment of fees for licences. The power of the French to obtain bait under this Agreement will be strictly restricted to the treaty shore; but, on the other hand, the French will retain their system of bounties, to which they attach importance, not so much because of the assistance it gives to the French industry as because it subserves their policy of training fishermen in time of peace for service in the French fleet in time of war.

I will only say one word with regard to the declaration which relates to Siam. I allude to it because, although in that declaration the two Powers reaffirm the Agreement of 1896 they only specifically mention Articles 1 and 2 of that Agreement. The reason why these two Articles are selected is that they are the only ones which relate specifically to Siamese territory. By reaffirming Articles 1 and 2 we reaffirm the principle of the sovereignty of Siam and the principle of free trade in the Menam Valley and the upper portion of the Mekong. At the same time we define the spheres of influence of the two countries outside that guaranteed portion. As a matter of fact, the influence of Great Britain and of France is already exercised in these territories; and we hope before long to take the House into our confidence and communicate to them the Agreement embodying the measures we thought it necessary to take in order to safeguard our interests in the districts which fall within our sphere of influence. The House will see that both Powers disclaim any intention of annexing Siamese territory, and they say that any influence they may exercise shall be exercised in strict conformity with the provisions of existing treaties.

I think I have now said all that it is necessary to say, I hope at not undue length, about this Agreement from the point of view of what I may call a profit-and-loss account. But that is not the point of view which interests the people of this country, and it is not as a commercial bargain that we present the Agreement to the House. There is one excellent reason if there were no other why we should not discuss it or criticise it from that point of view—I mean that most of the rights and privileges which have been surrendered either by ourselves or by France are sentimental rather than tangible, and there is manifestly no common standard by which you can assess the value or appraise the equivalent of a sentiment you do not feel yourselves. We present this Agreement to the House as an international instrument for securing an object of State policy which has been long and ardently desired and often attempted, but hitherto without success, by statesmen of both political Parties in this country. If Lord Lansdowne has been more fortunate than his predecessors in achieving that result, it is partly due, no doubt, to the fact that he has taken up the threads of diplomacy at a time when the personal wishes and exertions of the rulers on both sides of the Channel were seconded by the unanimous sentiment of their subjects and Parliaments. But it is due to Lord Lansdowne to say, what he would not and could not say himself, that the result would never have been obtained at all but for the patient perseverance and the sympathetic tact which he has brought to bear on these negotiations, and with which he has insisted throughout all these long months of discussion—months not devoid of serious anxiety with regard to events which were passing in other parts of the world—on subordinating all minor considerations of detail to the achievement of the great object he had at heart. This Agreement marks a great step forward in the direction in which all of us desire that we should travel. The last quarter of a century has been for ourselves, as for the French nation, an era of increasing territorial aggrandisement and accumulating responsibilities, forced upon us for the most part against our will, by the changing of the old order into a new one by the virtual discovery of a new continent and the inevitable dissolution of its ancient barbarisms when brought into contact with the march of Western civilisation. Opinions may, of course, differ here, as they differ on the other side of the Channel, as to the wisdom or the necessity of that policy in the past. But as regards the future there can be no two questions that the only safe and prudent policy for us to pursue, the only policy consistent with the faithful discharge of the stewardship we have undertaken, will be a policy of administrative concentration and consolidation. It was impossible that we should devote our efforts whole-heartedly to that task so long as there existed in different parts of the world causes of conflict between ourselves and our principal colleagues in the regeneration of Africa, delicate questions, touching acutely national susceptibilities, and supposed points of national honour. That these difficulties should have been removed so smoothly and comprehensively is not merely a conspicuous triumph for diplomacy not merely a fresh guarantee of international peace, but I hope it is also a system that we are passing out of that transitional stage in which the success of one nation is regarded as implying of necessity detriment to another, and in which the missionaries of Empire, like too many missionaries of another class, demonstrate their affection for the ideals of progress and civilisation by the hearty jealousy and distrust which they entertain for one another.

In our opinion, the advantages we gain under the convention itself are ample to warrant any sacrifices we ask the House to make; but the real *quid pro quo* for these sacrifices is not to be found within the four corners of the convention, nor even in the general adjustment of interests between the two countries embodied in the documents which accompany it. If that were so, there would be nothing to distinguish this Agreement from agreements entered into from time to time by various countries for the settlement of some frontier dispute or some trivial question of jurisdiction. What constitutes the distinctive feature of this Agreement, to my mind, is that the parties pledge themselves, not merely to abstain from poaching on one another's preserves, but to do all in their power to further one another's interests. We promise to give to one another, as friends, advantages which are ordinarily given only to allies; and it is as the pledges of friendship rather than as the terms of a compromise between jealous and exacting litigants that we ask the House to assent to these concessions. In Africa, as well as in Asia, there is room enough and to spare for the influence of different European nations. And if that influence is exercised, as under the provisions of this instrument it will be, not in a spirit of commercial or political exclusiveness, but in a spirit of friendly and loyal collaboration, the Agreement will I hope not only prove of great advantage to those on whose behalf our influence is exerted, but also provide a working model for the adjustment in other parts of the world of differences between ourselves and rival nations which have contributed largely to those feelings of jealousy and distrust that have done so much to retard the spread of Western influence, and to add to that increasing and well-nigh intolerable burden of military expenditure which is thrown on the shoulders of the peoples of Europe.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

SIR EDWARD GREY (Northumberland, Berwick): The House is indebted to the noble Lord, not only for a very clear and comprehensive survey of the scope and details of the Agreement, but more especially for the closing part of his speech, in which, in a lofty tone, he sketched what ought to be the ideal state of relations between the different great nations of Europe in the process of their expansion in the world at large. Why we especially welcome that is that in the convention that is now before us we have to a degree which we have never had, at any rate for a very long time, a proof that an ideal of that kind is not entirely separate from practice. There are two ways in which we may look at this Agreement. I admire the way in which the noble Lord, discussing it from the point of view of profit-and-loss, held that the scales have been delicately adjusted, and pointed out how the concession was so evenly balanced that the scale inclined neither one way nor the other. I do not propose to discuss the Agreement from the point of view of a bargain between two Governments; but, if I did, I do not think I should be quite so confident as the noble Lord is that the balance of the scales is so equally adjusted. There is, no doubt, a good deal to be made out of the Agreement, if you look at it from the point of view of a bargain between the two countries. I admit that it is a considerable gain, as the noble Lord has contended, that our hand in Egypt is to a considerable extent freed; but I do not think it is as free a hand as we are giving in Morocco; and when the noble Lord instances the progress of our trade in Tunis, he might have mentioned another Agreement with regard to Madagascar, which draws a very different picture as to what British trade might be in Morocco. Again, the rights which France sacrifices in Newfoundland were limited, admittedly limited, though the extent of the limitation was always the subject of debate. But tbe rights which we give up in return for the French concessions are absolute. There are many criticisms of that kind to be made, and I do not mention these in order to discount the effect of the Agreement, because I think it is entirely wrong to look at it as a bargain between the two countries. I am not going to pursue the question which country has got the most. If it be the case, at I think it is, that France has gained a great deal, both sentimentally and materially, under this Agreement, I do not grudge it in the least. A great deal certainly she has gained with our good will and in consequence of our concessions, and that will be a matter for satisfaction to both countries.

But the real point of view from which we ought to look at the Agreement is the point of view of general policy. I do not think it is an expression of general policy so much as an expression of general sincere good will towards each other on the part of both nations. That is the spirit in which the House will desire that the Agreement as a whole should be regarded; and if they will study the Agreement closely they will see how much more important the Agreement is in the spirit in this case than in the letter, especially with regard to the future. Take Article 9, for instance, of the Agreement, which relates to Egypt and Morocco: "The two Governments agree to afford to one another their diplomatic support in order to obtain the execution of the clauses of the present declaration regarding Egypt and Morocco." The words "declaration regarding Egypt and Morocco" are in themselves somewhat vague, and the phrase "diplomatic support" is again vague. Everything depends on the spirit and not upon the letter; but it is precisely because so much does depend on the spirit that there are, in that clause alone, great opportunities, looking to the probabilities of future politics, for the two nations using the Agreement, by a liberal interpretation of that article, to draw closer to each other. There will be continual opportunities of befriending each other under that one clause alone, if it be interpreted in the spirit in which I believe the Agreement is conceived.

The notable feature of this Agreement is that, although it is drawn up between ourselves and France, it deals with the interests of third parties—with the interests of Morocco, for instance. and with the interests of Siam. I think that is rather a novel way of dealing with the interests of third parties; but when you are dealing with the interests of those countries which are in a position of minimum stability, I have always been an advocate for the great European nations who have joint interests dealing directly with each other and not leaving their interests to be settled by intrigue or diplomatic strife at the Courts of the Powers. It is much better that they should be frank with each other; and, to take the noble Lord's illustration, I hope that what the Government has done in regard to Morocco and Siam may be used as a working model when favourable circumstances arise, in the case of Persia, China, and other places where we have interests of the same kind. It is true that this Agreement does begin by setting out that the Governments concerned do not mean to disturb the *status quo* in Egypt or in Morocco. It has hitherto been the case that whenever two Governments laid special stress upon their desire and intention to maintain the *status quo* it was really meant that the *status quo* was in imminent danger of being disturbed. I agree, of course, that in all good faith it is the desire of both parties to this Agreement to see the *status quo* maintained in Morocco; but Morocco itself is not a party to this Agreement, and nobody looking towards the future can help fearing that the *status quo*, as far as Morocco is concerned, is not one which it is in the power of Europe to maintain. It is essentially so unstable that you cannot contemplate with confidence that the *status quo* will be maintained. What this Agreement does, therefore, is to prescribe and preserve the policy of friendship between the two countries in the event of that *status quo* being disturbed, and that I think is a great advantage. Both with regard to Egypt and Morocco, and with regard also to Newfoundland, we have all felt that there has been danger for years past of our relations with France being disturbed by events which were beyond our control and beyond the control of the French Government. These three questions alone have been like mines that have drifted into the sea of our diplomacy, and have made navigation very difficult and perilous, and made us feel that there has been real danger, even with the best intentions, of an explosion taking place which might endanger the relations of the two Governments. I cannot say that these questions are removed by this Agreement, but their explosive character is taken away. There is no longer a danger that the relations of the two Powers will be disturbed by these questions, and that is an enormous gain.

When we come to the Agreement as it stands, it would seem very simple — so simple that it has been asked, quite naturally—Why has it not been arrived at before? The noble Lord was careful in his speech to explain that, whatever credit he took for the Government for having made this Agreement, that credit was not taken at the expense of their predecessors. It was a natural reserve for him to make, because the present Government have been in power, I think, for two years, but for thirteen out of the sixteen years preceding their predecessor was Lord Salisbury's Government. Now, Lord Salisbury was not averse to making graceful concessions. He was, I think, willing at any time to make not only commercial, but territorial concessions if by doing so he could secure favourable relations with our European neighbours. So far from criticising that, I will say I am sure that sober reflection even now, and perhaps still more in the future, will always be ready to place that to Lord Salisbury's credit. He would not have been averse to an Agreement of this kind, had it been possible sooner. I do not think it was possible that it could have been made two years ago. I doubt whether any Government in this country could, a few years ago, have with confidence recommended to the House of Commons or to public opinion in this country the concessions we have made in this Agreement. I doubt also whether the French Government would have ventured to recommend to their Chambers or to their country the concessions which they have made in the present Agreement. The fact is that this Agreement means really a change of policy which is common not only to ourselves, but to some other nations in Europe as well. Other things have happened in the last few years that were not possible some time ago. Europe was some time ago divided into two, I will not say hostile, but certainly not friendly, camps—the Triple Alliance and the Dual Alliance. There has been a tendency to obliteration of the hard-and-fast lines between those two camps. Italy has made her own arrangements with France directly. Austria has made her own arrangements with Russia directly. There has been a tendency to more direct inter-communication, more direct settlement; and this has been more favourable to a frank adjustment of the relations between these Powers; and we in our turn have now taken part in making a sort of arrangement with a view to creating greater frankness and friendliness between ourselves and France. It would not have been possible to establish this Agreement between ourselves and France some years ago, because the atmosphere was not so favourable. We are told by geologists that our own country has gone through various changes, from a glacial epoch to a genial epoch, and that trees and plants which flourished in this country in the glacial epoch would not grow with us now, and plants and trees that flourish with us now could not have flourished in the glacial epoch. Some time ago the atmosphere between ourselves and France may be said to have been of the glacial epoch. It has happily now changed to a genial epoch.

How has the change been brought about? The noble Lord has said that the head of the State in France and our own King have had a good deal to do in promoting the change. The Governments of the two countries have also borne their share in promoting the change. I entirely endorse what the noble Lord has said about the willingness of Lord Lansdowne to take advantage of the favourable opportunity which offered, and especially we may mention on the other side M. Delcassé as a Foreign Minister equally quick and ready to take advantage of the change. Groups of Members of this House and of the French Chamber have had something to do, through their friendly relations with each other, in promoting this change. And last, but not least, I think the Press on both sides of the Channel have had their share. Without their co-operation I doubt whether all the efforts of other parties, whatever the intention, could have gone as far as they have done. The result of all that has been to make possible an Agreement of this kind now, which would not have been possible some time ago, and the great return to both countries for the concessions they have made in this Agreement is the good will of each of them. It is sometimes said that good will is not an asset on which we can rely between nations. Well, of course it is not a thing which we can put on paper as you can put the terms of a treaty on paper. But anything written, anything expressed in definite terms, is valueless unless good will is behind it. If there be good will which is genuine and sincere, the mere fact that it is not expressed on paper is not of very great importance. Like all human relations, good will and friendship may be disturbed by unforeseen events in the future; but we all feel that friction between ourselves and another nation is a great liability which entails upon us anxiety and expenditure; and I do not see why we should not count good will between ourselves and other nations as an asset of some value. In this case especially I welcome it, because France, I think especially amongst nations, has shown, what is not common in international relations, a certain capacity for friendship. There are many nations who conduct their relations with perfect propriety and all the forms of friendliness; but France when she has had friendly relations with other Powers has specially distinguished herself by her capacity for friendship. No one viewing the relations between France and Russia since the Dual Alliance was known to the world, can fail to discover that when France is a friend she is an exceedingly good friend; and, therefore, I think in the good will, which is not the result, so much as the cause, of this Agreement, there is an asset of real value to the two nations. I trust the friendship for which I claim so essential a part in bringing about the good relations between the two nations will continue to keep these relations good. I trust the two existing Governments and their successors on either side of the Channel, when they have any, will also do their utmost to promote this good will. I think it is based upon a real recognition for the first time, both on our part and on that of France, that we have ceased to be aggressive Powers.

I believe with regard to ourselves the feeling is really spreading in the world that we are not an aggressive Power. [AN HON. MEMBER: Tibet.] It may seem soon to say so. An hon. Member exclaimed "Tibet." I do not wish to introduce controversial topics. It may seem a little soon, a little bold, to make that statement now as to such a feeling being abroad so soon after the comments aroused in Europe during the Boer War; but I think there is some substance in it. Other countries have come to realise that even those among us who are the most watchful of the actions of other Powers and solicitous for our own expansion have come to look upon our responsibilities as now large enough. What the noble Lord has so well said this afternoon about the consolidation of our resources is not new; it has been said before, but never with much general acceptance and never with such real sincerity of feeling in the House before. The necessity for consolidation and, I do not say restriction, but restraint of further expansion, has been brought home to the country, and is likely to continue to be brought home to the country; and if there be expansions as, for instance, in Tibet at the present moment — if there be an exception there—I wish to remind the

House of the fact that I am dealing with the state of public opinion, not with the action of the Government, and the mere fact of the jealousy with which public opinion is watching the course of events in Tibet and the apprehensions that have been expressed are further proof that public opinion is settled in the desire that there should be restriction of further expansion and responsibilities. Of course the coolness of our relations with France some years ago arose out of the fact that we had an expanding colonial empire and France wanted a colonial empire. But now France has such an empire—no doubt to a great extent undeveloped, but full of possibilities—and France has come to realise that the concessions we have made in Africa of rights indisputably ours are willingly made with the object of enabling her to develop the power she has there. Her claim, I understand, was put forward, not as a right to any concession in Gambia or adjustments of territory in the region of Lake Chad, but on the ground that we had our territory so disposed that we could freely develop even if we made these concessions, whereas the concessions we have made are absolutely vital to the development of the French possessions. We have made the concessions not so much from the idea that they are a fair *quid pro quo* for the Newfoundland arrangement, but for the inherent reason that we regard these matters as of little importance to us and essential to France. It is evidence of our good will that we make these concessions to her. That is the spirit in which the Agreement has been made, and that is the spirit in which I believe it has been entered into by France; and in the future we shall see these two Empires side by side in West Africa, for to a considerable extent they will be conterminous, with an increasing development of their resources and an increase of the friendly relations between the two Powers. I welcome the Agreement, and I hope, as the noble Lord has said, the Government will lose no opportunity of making it a working model for other cases where it is possible to do so. I welcome this Agreement because I believe not only will it be a working model for other cases, but because it has in it great possibilities for keeping us in contact with France, with a growth of friendly relations to the advantage of both countries, and the many points of contact in various parts of the world will not, as in the past, be occasion for dispute and debate, but will be so many opportunities for the interchange of international courtesies.

*MR. GIBSON BOWLES: The extremely lucid speech of the noble Lord in introducing this Bill, and the highly interesting moral lecture given to us by the right hon. Baronet who has just spoken, must make the House feel—and I think it is true—that there is a strong feeling outside this House in favour of this Agreement. I have put down an Amendment to the Second Reading of this Bill as a statement of the case the noble Lord would have to meet, and of certain criticisms he would have to answer. The noble Lord has to a certain extent answered those criticisms; and for that reason, and for others which the House will appreciate without my mentioning them, I do not propose to move my Amendment, but to leave it as my statement of certain criticisms which required, and some of which still require, to be answered. We have had a duet of approval of the whole of this Agreement from the Under-Secretary and the ex-Under-Secretary. Minister smiles at ex-Minister, Under-Secretary smiles at ex-Under-Secretary, like the augurs in the streets of Rome. The right hon. Baronet referred to Siam and other places and expressed his approval of the action of the present Under-Secretary. But it is right to remember that he, too, is a lady with a past, that there have been lapses from virtue on both sides; and under these circumstances it may possibly be permissible to a Member of the House, who takes an independent view of this matter and has independent criticisms to offer, to speak. I was struck by one remark of the noble Lord. He said that the dispute between England and France was not how little they could concede to one another. No, it was how much belonging to somebody else they could concede to one another. The noble Lord seems entirely unconscious of the fact that almost all the gifts from England to France and almost all the gifts from France to England are made at the expense of other countries. That is a criticism which has not been answered.

It has already been remarked that while the House is asked to approve the convention, it is not called upon to approve of the two declarations which form part of the scheme. The declarations are even more important than the convention itself. They are quite as much binding treaties, and are far larger and more serious than the convention which alone we are asked to approve in so many words. We are asked to give express approval to the convention and tacit approval to the declarations; on the ground, as I understand it, that the more important declarations are acts done by the Sovereign in the exercise of his prerogative, and, therefore, do not require approval from the Houses of Parliament, while the less important convention, forsooth, only because it makes a charge on public funds, and alienates territory of our own, does require such approval. I believe that is an entirely unsound doctrine. I hold that every serious treaty made by the Sovereign should receive the approval of Parliament. That is a doctrine which is laid down in our history. When in 1701 the Partition Treaty was made this House passed on 21st March of that year an Amendment to the Address to the King in these words—

> "Resolved, and also to lay before His Majesty the ill-consequences of the Treaty of Partition) passed under the Great Seal of England during the sitting of Parliament and without the advice of the same) to this Kingdom and the peace of Europe."

The result was that the Whig Chancellor Somers was impeached, and though acquitted by the Lords he was dismissed from the King's counsels for passing the treaty under the Seal. That Resolution, which remains on the Journals of the House, taken with the subsequent message of the Sovereign of 6th June, 1812, does seem to me to embody the doctrine that all serious treaties ought to be submitted to the House "to use the Queen's words before the same should be concluded"; and I may remind the House that although we have allowed to fall into desuetude the doctrine there laid down, it is still adhered to by the United States whose earliest act after achieving independence was to set up that Committee of Foreign Relations whose eleven members may require information and inspect the Foreign Office correspondence while negotiations are proceeding, and who can, through the Senate, prevent the President from concluding any treaty whatever. Something of that sort is urgently needed now here.

Now I come to the convention. I will not recount the whole of its history. What I contend is that in this convention France has only given up rights she never possessed and still retains the only rights to which she ever had a title. Let the House remember that Newfoundland was discovered by Cabot, an Englishman, in 1496, and was annexed in the sixteenth century to the Crown of England, and what the treaty of 1713 did was to add to the English rights of discovery the right of conquest and the treaty rights of France. Newfoundland has always been treated as the Cinderella of the Colonies. It was positively until the end of the eighteenth century the settled policy of the English Government to keep Newfoundland uninhabited under the notion that it was only useful for its fisheries. What now did the 13th Article of the Treaty of Utrecht do? It acknowledged in England the fullest sovereignty over the whole of Newfoundland, France engaged not to raise any pretensions to any part of that territory of any sort or at any time, not to erect any habitation, and not to land on the island at any other time than the fishing season. There was another Foreign Office mistranslation in this treaty, for the words "not to land" were translated "not to frequent," which are much less restrictive. The French were not to land except at a specific time and for a specific purpose, that specific purpose being to dry fish. On these conditions they were allowed to fish in the territorial waters of the French shore which is two-fifths of the whole shore of the island. That was the right given to the French by the Treaty of Utrecht; and it required an absolute grant of that right from the Sovereign to enable them to fish in the territorial waters at all. It was an equal, concurrent, and not an exclusive right; and to suggest that it was exclusive of the English right to fish in the English waters of the island was to suggest that the surrender of sovereignty made in the most solemn terms by France was not real or effective. Now, in making the Treaty of Versailles in 1783 at the close of our war with the United States the English Sovereign declared that he would prevent his subjects from "interrupting by their competition" the exercise of the French right of fishing, which was, however, not enlarged by that declaration, for it was defined as the right assigned to them by the Treaty of Utrecht. It is clear, therefore, to me—I will not labour the thing and I know it is disputed—that the French right was a right, not exclusive but concurrent. There is undoubtedly this to be said that that declaration of 1783 did lend itself to what I should call a wresting or forcing of the text, to the art of what the French in a neat expression call *solliciter les textes.* The forcing of that text has gone on ever since, and it has been encouraged and accepted by English Governments in a manner to my mind very surprising indeed. As I read that declaration the French only had an equal right with the English people of fishing in the territorial waters, but they went further and claimed the exclusive right. It practically came to this, that any man other than a Frenchman might not catch a fish for his breakfast. No doubt the French regard this fishery as a source of supply of men for their navy, and that, no doubt, is the reason why they pressed their claims with such pertinacity. With English compliance the French pretensions rose to an amazing extent until at last it came to this, that in 1891 in the French Senate a French senator said—

> "On the French shore of Newfoundland we are as much at home as at Paris . . we may prevent the English from so much as looking at the French shore."

The result of all this English compliance has been that Newfoundland, so far as the French shore is concerned, is practically an uninhabited country. There is not a building, not a tree felled, not a mine opened, not a field ploughed, not a line of railway, and the few people who live there live under no law and are the inhabitants of a sort of Newfoundland Alsatia. At the same time the French make no use of this place except for the drying of fish and for the catching of lobsters. I do not know whether there is any French version of the fable of the "dog in the manger," but even in that fable it was not suggested that the master of the horse helped the dog up into the manger to keep the horse away from his food, and that is what England did here. I will not dwell on the question of whether canning lobsters is drying fish, or upon French bounties or the Bait Act, though these are important incidents. Suffice it to say that these fishing rights so used, and so wrongfully admitted, have had the effect I have described, and have made it impossible to develop the enormous resources that Newfoundland possesses. They have rendered the place almost uninhabitable; and they seriously interfere with the welfare of the large population, amounting to over 250,000, who now inhabit the island. I have never denied that the French had rights, but I say under this convention they have abandoned rights they never did possess, and still retain all the rights they ever had. In order to compensate them for this abandonment of nothing we are to give them compensation, the amount of which has yet to be settled.

This Agreement indeed bristles at every turn with unsettled conditions which may lead to great difficulties in the future. They are to get not only pecuniary compensation. but also territorial cessions in Gambia and on the Niger. An illustrious Frenchman once said—

> "Never was there any treaty between the French and English but that the French always overreached them by their wit and ability."

That certainly seems to me to have been the case on this occasion. One question I am going to ask, and that is, Has Newfoundland been consulted? On the 14th of April last, I asked the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord—

> "How it is proposed to provide for the payment by His Majesty's Government of the indemnity stipulated by the Convention with France, of the 8th of April, 1904, to be paid to French citizens; will the convention providing for that payment and for certain French rights on the coast of Newfoundland be submitted in any, and, if so, in what manner to the approval of the Colony of Newfoundland, and in what manner will it be submitted to the approval of this House.'

To that the First Lord of the Treasury replied—

> "As I think I have already indicated, the indemnity will be paid by this country, and of course an Estimate will have to be presented for that payment. The Newfoundland Government need not be consulted with regard to that payment as they will not share in it. They will have to be consulted as to the regulations which will have to be put in force upon what is known as the treaty shore."

That was the answer given to me then, but I think there is now something more than that. It appears from supplementary declarations made by Lord Lansdowne, that the treaty absolutely prohibits the Newfoundland Legislature, for all time, from passing a Bait Bill. It prohibits them from doing that which in 1887 they did do and which but for this treaty they might do again. That may be right, but at the same time it is a serious interference with the rights of the colony. But that is not the only interference, because we have undertaken that the policing of the territorial waters and arrangements for the prevention of the smuggling of alcohol shall be carried out under an arrangement arrived at between the English and French Governments. That certainly takes out of Newfoundland's hands a thing which ought to be left to her. But that is contrary to our most solemn undertakings if done without Newfoundland's consent. In 1857 the question arose as to how far the Imperial Government could interfere with the rights of Newfoundland, and the Imperial Government then disclaimed any intention of interfering with the rights of Newfoundland at all without the previous consent of the Newfoundland legislature. I read from a despatch signed by Mr. H. Labouchere, 26th March, 1857—

> "There are," he said, "two principles which have guided them and which will continue to guide them—namely, that the rights at present enjoyed by the community of Newfoundland are not to be ceded or exchanged without their assent, and that the constitutional mode of submitting measures for that assent is by bringing them before the Colonial Legislature.',

And he adds that—

> "The consent of the community of Newfoundland is regarded by His Majesty's Government as the essential preliminary."

I submit that that is the right course to take on this occasion. You are interfering seriously with the rights of Newfoundland, and before concluding the matter it should be submitted to the Legislature of Newfoundland. There has been a modification of the territorial and maritime rights of Newfoundland without such safeguards and previous consent as required by the assurances given in 1857. I gathered from the answer made to me on the occasion by the First Lord of the Treasury that it was not considered necessary to get the consent of Newfoundland. I hope I was wrong in that, but that was the inference I drew. I trust there has been consultation and that in these matters their assent has or will be obtained. Sir, this arrangement is still full of the vice which tainted the former arrangements with regard to Newfoundland. It still leaves the question of the territorial waters undecided. It leaves the policing of the district to England and France, and to that extent it impairs and leaves under considerable uncertainty the sovereignty of these waters and these shores, and thus retains the vices of all the old arrangements which led to the disputes in the past. I think we have made a bad bargain. I do not think it is so bad for the Newfoundlanders if they choose to consent to it. On the whole it is rather a good thing for them because they have got rid of some of the strong fetters which bound them. We are to pay the indemnity, and it is only right that we should do so because the position to which they have been brought is largely owing to the acts of this country. But, indeed, I do not quarrel with the compensations we are to give, for I would give this, of our own, and much more to be on good terms with the French.

There are, however, the other declarations which are far more important. My quarrel with these is that they give away, not our own, but other people's possessions. There is first of all the Far Eastern declaration. In Madagascar we have withdrawn our protest against the French tariff, a concession of great importance. In the New Hebrides we have agreed—and here there is another instance of undecided matters – we have agreed to draw up an Agreement, and a Commission is to settle all disputes of the so-called "nationals" — a strange word — who are to come under the Agreement. That leaves that matter very much undecided. These two points involve no principle. But the matter of Siam is very different. It does involve a principle. No doubt the French have cast longing eyes upon Siam for a considerable time. In 1889 the French Government proposed its neutralisation, and the House will remember the debates on Siam which took place in 1893. The French claimed the whole of the territory to the east of Mekong; Lord Rosebery used the most minatory language but to no effect. When the French forced the Menam, invaded Siam, and ordered British cruisers out of Siamese waters, Lord Rosebery gave way, and the French annexed the one-fourth of Siam to the east of the Mekong. In 1893 we, who were then on the other side, resisted and reprobated Lord Rosebery's concessions. Luang Prabang, Battambong, and Angkok were familiar in our mouths as household words, and Chantabun especially, the annexation of which by France engraved it on Lord Curzon's heart, where it remained engraved till he went away to India to annex Tibet for England. After this came Lord Salisbury's Agreement of 1896. I could never quite understand why that Agreement was made, or why things were not allowed to remain as Lord Rosebery left them in 1893. That Agreement dealt with two other fourths of Siam and neutralised them. Now comes the present Agreement which strikes a line through the neutralised portion, and for the first time makes the limit of French influence, not the frontier line of the neutralised portion, but the Mekong itself. In other words, by this new arrangement, French influence has been spread over the whole of the country between the Mekong on the East and the Menam on the West. That is a very serious matter. It is the more serious because Lord Salisbury when he made his arrangement gave us to understand that it was absolutely the last that would be entered into with regard to Siam. These were his words—

> "We fully recognise the rights of Siam to full and undisturbed enjoyment in accordance with long usage. The events of this recent history certainly have a tendency to encourage doubts of the stability of the Siamese dominions, and without in any degree sharing those doubts, or admitting the possibility within any future with which we have to deal of the Siamese independence being compromised. Her Majesty's Government could not but feel that there would be an advantage, in giving some security to the commercial world, that in regard to the regions where the most active development is likely to take place, no further disturbances of territorial ownership are to be apprehended.

But now we come to a further disturbance.

EARL PERCY: No.

*MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I understand it to be, I say it is, a further disturbance. The Government have agreed that the French sphere of influence should extend up to the left bank and that ours should end on the right bank of the Mekong.

EARL PERCY: Under this Agreement there is no disturbance of the frontier of the neutralised portion of Siam as fixed by the Agreement of 1896.

*MR. GIBSON BOWLES: It is quite true that the neutralised two quarters of Siam are kept neutralised, but the French sphere of influence is now extended up the middle of them. The difference between the 1896 and the present Agreement is that, whereas under the former France was to keep to the east of the Mekong, she is now let loose over the whole of the intermediate country between the Mekong and the Menam. Although certain high-sounding phrases are used—it is now "political *status*"—there is no doubt that what is intended sooner or later is, first, the establishment of a protectorate, and then the annexation by France of the whole of that territory. I can expect nothing else, and it seems to me that that is what those who signed this declaration must have anticipated.

I now come to the North African Declaration, and that, morally speaking, is even less creditable than the Siam arrangement. The declaration begins by saying that England has no intention of altering the political *status* of Egypt. Why, Sir, I defy anybody to tell me in language known to the law of nations, what is the political *status* of Egypt and England's place therein. We are there in defiance of the Sovereign of

Egypt; we exercise authority there by a Consul-General acting through a Viceroy, and yet we entirely disregard the Sovereign whose vassal the Viceroy is, and act wholly according to our own ideas of what is for the good of the country. There is no political *status*: it is all chaos. Lord Lansdowne speaks of "our work," of "our task," and of "our predominant position." It must doubtlesss be admitted that the occupation by England has been a great blessing to Egypt; it has produced most remarkable prosperity, and were our occupation to cease great injury would undoubtedly result to the Egyptian people and to Egypt herself. But that does not alter the fact that our presence there is in violation of the rights of the Sovereign of the country, in violation of our most solemn promises to Europe to retire, that we are there in no sort of settled or known capacity, and that the whole position as regards "political *status*" is nothing more nor less than chaos. Even now, we are to hold Egypt only on condition that we accept the Suez Canal Convention of 1888, whereby we undertake to allow our enemies to use that canal against us in time of war. But France now acquiesces in our occupation of Egypt, and the difference that that acquiescence makes is enormous. It appears to prepare the way for that protectorate and that annexation which I fancy cannot now be delayed much longer. The real price of the acquiescence of France in our occupation of Egypt is the abandonment of Morocco to France, and in spite of the terms used to conceal its character, the transaction seems to me to be one of a profoundly immoral and improper character. France is to "watch over the tranquillity" of Morocco, which is an express destruction of its independence, yet both France and England profess to have "no intention of altering the political *status*," when they simply destroy it. France and England assume the right to forbid the erection of fortifications on the coast of Morocco. But it is a well-known fact that the Sovereign of a country has a right to erect any fortifications he considers necessary for his own defence. That right was indeed expressly affirmed by all Europe for all sovereigns in the Treaty of Paris of 1814. Any denial of that right is a denial of sovereignty, and the very fact that this provision has been put into the Agreement shows that France means nothing less than the denial of the sovereignty of the Sultan of Morocco. The whole country is to be brought under the influence of France, and of Spain to such extent as France may sanction. In none of these arrangements has any Power interested been consulted by this country. In regard to Morocco, Spain has been handed over to France to make such Agreements as France may choose to sanction. Now between France and Spain a protocol was certainly signed last year by Senor Leon y Castillo and M. Delcassé, expressing the views then held by Spain and France with regard to Morocco, and that protocol declared that the triangle on which Cape Spartel and Tangiers lie was to be neutralised, that south of that a large band should be placed under Spanish influence, and that south of that again there should be a still larger band under French influence. There was also an engagement that Spain should hand over to Germany one of two ports—either Casablanca or Rabat. I am sure that that protocol was signed. I admit it probably no longer exists, but I believe it is on those lines the final settlement will be made, and we may confidently expect Germany to come in and demand her port, whatever else may happen.

These two declarations together amount in Egypt, Siam, and Morocco, to no less than the partition of three new Polands —to a compact of plunder. It will not, and cannot, come to good either for England or for France. I have felt it right to criticise the convention from that point of view. But I must now say that from a European point of view—and, as M. Thiers once said, one must be a good European— this Agreement is of the highest import and may be of the greatest advantage. We in England have long been isolated from Europe. We have gone to the uttermost ends of the earth to gain settlements for trade rather than for political purposes, and that has isolated us. Nevertheless, from time to time we have made efforts to bring ourselves back to the general system of Europe, and to make arrangements for the performance of our duties. There has been the Concert of Europe, always insufficient, always cumbrous, and, at the moment when most wanted, always incompetent to deal with the culprit it was intended to reach. This present Agreement with France is a return to the older, simpler, and, as I think, better system of the balance of power, which, strangely enough, the Treaty of Utrecht was the first expressly to recognise, for an article of that treaty declares that it was made, among other purposes, "for securing the tranquillity of Europe by a balance of power." The balance of power instead of being an arrangement to keep the peace of Europe by an agreement between all the Powers is an arrangement to keep the peace by an Agreement between two or three Powers. This is not new to this country, for both Queen Elizabeth and Cromwell came to agreements with France against Spain upon the balance of power and with the same object. This balance of power has been much derided and has, in fact, been used as a pretext to cover the commission of crimes, but it is an effectual method of keeping aggressors in order. It is simply an imitation of those elementary devices by which society bands itself together and keeps its own members in order. I believe that no combination can be so effectual in producing a balance of power as the combination of England and France, and, from that point of view, I think great good may result. There are not absent from Europe at the present moment dangerous elements. We may have no Charles V. or Philips, but there are stalking through Europe ambitions which must be curtailed and which may be developed to a greater extent than seems at present. Against such it is well to raise a visible barrier in England and France. The successive plunder of successively isolated Powers has been seen. The business of the balance of power is to isolate the isolater, to put the isolation on the side of the aggressors, I trust this may have that effect. For Europe it is well that France and England should stand together. After all, there are no people so naturally geographically belonging to us as allies and friends as are the French people. England and France are not naturally enemies but friends, and ought to be permanent allies. From this point of view therefore, and from regard to its beneficial effect on the European situation, I welcome this agreement, as being calculated, apart from the immorality of portions of it, to secure the peace of Europe.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): The Government ought to be congratulated from this quarter of the House upon the new departure they have made in bringing this Bill forward for the approval of Parliament. Contrary to the views of Mr. Gladstone, who, upon this matter, always remained a Tory, and who always opposed vehemently such a proposal, the Government have rightly brought this convention forward for the confirmation of the House.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): We expressed that view in 1896. It is not new.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: This course has not been adopted before in a matter so large. This is a very large matter and the question has never before been brought before Parliament in this way. It is an acknowledged fact that we do not lose anything but gain by these discussions and the hands of the respective Governments are strengthened by these proposals being brought before Parliament for confirmation. Foreign Governments in their dealings with us have very often had their hands greatly strengthened in the past by adopting this course, and I think we shall do well to always in the future bring such proposals before Parliament. There are three declarations. The first is called the convention but it is not the convention alluded to here. The second declaration is brought before us and not the first nor the third in this Bill. But you, Mr. Speaker, have allowed full debate upon all the three, and it is undoubtedly impossible to separate them, and Lord Lansdowne and the Government have treated them in this way. We all shared the sentiments of the Prime Minister when he expressed the hope that all these declarations would be debated as a whole. The first thing that strikes one about these two conventions and the declarations is the extraordinary new departure in the foreign policy of the country, the completeness of the reversal of the policy of Lord Salisbury, and the complete acceptance by the Government of the views we have been urging for years on this side of the House. M. Delcassé desired an agreement of that kind, and he made a statement to this effect in an interview with an English journalist, Mr. Arnold White, which was published in the *Manchester Guardian.* In times gone by Conservative Members and Conservative statesmen considered it absurd that such an agreement could be entered into by this country, but now happily this arrangement had been come to by a new departure. The basis of the foreign policy of Lord Salisbury had always been the maintenance of the *status quo* in the Mediterannean, and Lord Salisbury exchanged notes with Italy in which this policy was set forth. That was the basis of Lord Salisbury's policy, and Morocco was in view at that time, but he was then dealing with Italy, Spain, Germany, and Austria. Lord Salisbury's idea was always a German alliance, and this was shared by the whole of his colleagues and the Conservative Members of this House, and it was supported in the strongest possible language by the then Colonial Secretary the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham, who, in a speech at Leicester on the 30th November, 1899, said—

> "The natural alliance is between ourselves and the great German Empire."

We on this side of the House have continually protested against the doctrine of permanent alliances, and I hope that alliance has gone by the board for ever. With regard to the details of this measure I agree with what has been said by my right hon. friend the Member for Northumberland as to the importance at this time of establishing friendship between France and ourselves by this Agreement. This feeling exists on both sides of the House, but the country does not shut its eyes to the fact that this Agreement has been arrived at somewhat hurriedly, and passes by questions of great difficulty and danger which might easily have been settled in this Bill. There are matters which have been under discussion for a long time, and which have reached such an advanced stage in negotiation that a very little push on our part at a time when we are giving up so much might have settled these points. This course would have avoided great dangers which may jeopardise the success of this Bill. On the whole, I approve of this Bill, although it gives up a great many things which might have been saved, and about which we are not going to wrangle, and it does not settle some of the questions which are highly dangerous, and which could have been settled in connection with this Bill. The hon. Member for King's Lynn has attacked the Newfoundland part of this measure; but I should think that if there is one good feature of this Bill it is that part which deals with the Newfoundland policy. The hon. Member is wrong in suggesting that Newfoundland has not been consulted——

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I drew that inference from my noble friend's speech, but it appears that I was wrong.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: The Newfoundland Cabinet was consulted at every stage, and the Newfoundland Legislature has approved of the whole Agreement which it has accepted. It is quite true that the great authority of Sir William Whiteway can be quoted against this Agreement, and he has published articles against it, and stated that the whole difficulty in the past had been caused by the ambiguities in the Treaties of Utrecht, Paris, and Versailles, and that the whole mischief will be caused in future by the ambiguity of this treaty. But the almost unanimous feeling in the Newfoundland Legislature is that ambiguities will be cleared up by this treaty, and those mostly concerned appear now to be fully satisfied. There is the secret report of Sir John Bramston and Admiral Erskine to the Secretary of State for the Colonies in 1899. This report is known in Newfoundland and extracts have been published. It is known to all the Newfoundland statesmen and it confirms the view of British rights which the hon. Member for King's Lynn has taken. Unfortunately we have been bound in this matter not by treaty rights, but by our own action and the secret instructions to our officers which have been of such a nature as to make it impossible for us to set up the high and dry view as to the meaning of the treaties. But while the Newfoundland settlement is an excellent settlement of a most dangerous question the price paid for it really includes Morocco and Siam as well. This Agreement does not get rid of internationalism in Egypt, and that prevents Egypt from being set off against Morocco. I may say in passing that there is a most extraordinary contradiction in the language of the arrangement, for although on the first stage of the despatch covering the Agreement Lord Lansdowne says that—

> "Our occupation of Egypt, at first regarded as temporary, has become firmly established,"

and on the third page that our—

> "task must not be impeded by any suggestion that our interest is of a temporary character,"

there is a curious declaration on page 5 which provides that "certain stipulations should remain in abeyance during the continuance of the occupation." The words which are employed are that the occupation is to be of a temporary nature. There is that strange contradiction, at all events, that internationalism is continued in Egypt, and that in Morocco there is no equivalent. Now the position which we have conceded to France in Morocco is the basis of the happy change in our relations which this convention makes, as regards the present and the future. It is an extraordinary and a startling fact that our policy appears to have been the result of a mere accident, a mere blunder, because it was our recognition of the French right to the Hinterland of Tripoli, and our allowing France something to give to Italy in exchange, which caused France to be able to gain Italy to her view in regard to Morocco, which she undoubtedly did gain, and which led to the giving up of the whole *status quo* in the Mediterranean. We often hear of continuity of policy in foreign affairs. Here we have the greatest breach of the long accepted maxim as to continuity of policy in foreign affairs that has ever occurred. What has occurred in regard to Morocco is, I think, on the whole wise, yet there is ground for thinking in the case of Siam that we have gone rather fast, and have not, perhaps, had due regard to British trade and capital in that country. The noble Lord has said that the Siam arrangement is based on Lord Salisbury's arrangement which was quoted by the hon. Member for King's Lynn. At the time the language used with regard to that arrangement was even stronger than that quoted by the hon. Member for King's Lynn. On 27th March, 1896, Lord Curzon used these words in this House—

> "The illusion that under this Agreement there has been the creation of two spheres of influence, and possibly at some future day of possession. Siamese rights remain intact over the whole. France has not gained a single right under this Agreement."

Lord Curzon quoted Lord Salisbury's despatch as to the right of Siam to the full and undisturbed enjoyment of the entire territory comprised within her dominions. There is something more interesting on this subject than the opinion of the French Government, and that is the declaration made by M. Etienne, who is not merely an ordinary Member of the French Assembly. As President of the Committé de l'Asie Française, he is stronger than his own Government. He dominates the Chamber on this subject. He says the Asiatic clauses of the Anglo-French Agreement are—

> "Of a nature to satisfy those of the colonial party who understand that we may hope . . . . . Confirmation of the free hand of France in the basin of the Mekong."

His paper, commenting further on the subject, and enlarging on his own words, says that Lord Salisbury's despatch was only for the British and Siamese, and the interpretation put upon the arrangement was "*une mauvaise plaisanterie.*" Lord Lansdowne claims that the Agreement will put an end to the friction that has existed between the two countries with regard to Siam. I am afraid that portion of the Agreement will only intensify it. Now the new doctrine comes that they are to have "liberty of action within their sphere of influence" in Siam. The phrase used is "sphere of influence," and that phrase was indignantly repudiated by Lord Curzon when applied to the Agreement of which this forms an explanation. We have large trading and capital interests in Siam. The Lancashire trade in cotton goods is a very large one, as you will find if you look at the Siamese figures. Our interests there were preserved by the arrangement of 1896, and we are told that they are preserved by this arrangement. The territory in the French sphere of influence comes within eighty miles of Bangkok and it includes Khorat, and one-third of the railway from Khorat to Bangkok, which taps the trade, and the swallowing up of that sphere will mean the destruction of very large British interests in Asia. Lord Lansdowne says this will end the attempts at Bangkok to play off one Power against another, and he says it puts an end also to what he call the seeds of international discord. What I am afraid of is that it means pressure on Bangkok for annexations, which are so prejudicial to British interests, which are the cause of alarm, and which in my belief might have been avoided if they had been looked to beforehand. French trade in Siam is very small as compared with ours. I doubt whether it is one per cent. as compared with ours. Siamese trade is nearly all within the British Empire—Singapore, Hong-Kong, the United Kingdom, and India. There is an enormous amount of our capital invested in Siam, and I think it is most unfortunate if by the looseness with which this treaty has been drawn there should arise such a feeling in Siam as should lead to difficulty there which a very little precaution might have avoided. The Government take up a position with regard to Siam which I think it is impossible to justify. The Government position is that the treaty of 1896 guaranteed Siam in her possessions, and that there was to be no annexation, while in this treaty also there is to be no annexation. Siamese territory has been annexed between 1896 and now. I am not putting forward these facts for the purpose of nagging against this treaty. I accept the treaty, but I regret that greater care was not used in its preparation. The noble Lord said he hoped soon to be able to give to the House the arrangement we have ourselves come to with Siam. There is a joint arrangement for the protection and good government of the Siamese Malay States, but the House is in the strange position that though neither the French Agreement nor the British Agreement is known, Lord Lansdowne freely incorporates our arrangement and the French arrangement in this despatch. They are mentioned in the despatch as if they were virtually a portion of the Agreement. The noble Lord says—

> "Two Agreements were entered into with Siam by the French Government. As the first of these was not ratified, a second Agreement was negotiated. The first Agreement has been entirely superseded, and there would be no object in presenting it to Parliament. Until the second has received the sanction of the French Chambers we cannot undertake to say that it has assumed its final shape."

Lord Salisbury was pledged against annexation in 1896. Under the present convention there is to be no annexation. But the French have forced annexation between 1896 and now. And yet we are virtually incorporating in this Treaty arrangements which have not received a final shape. I will not press this matter further, but I will say that the contention of the French colonial party that under this treaty they are going to get half of Siam seems to be too much based upon facts.

The other point I should like to mention is one to which we ought to attach importance. I mean the questions omitted from the convention, which one would have thought would have been dealt with, because they are likely to lead to danger in the future. One of them greatly interests Lancashire, and I am glad to see the hon. Member for Oldham, who feels very strongly on that point, present. That is the Concessions Régime of the French Congo. This is a matter which has double importance. It has been under negotiation between our Government and that of France for years, and now our Government are treating it as a private matter between the French Government and certain Liverpool firms. I suppose that hush money is to be paid in order to reach an equitable settlement; but that is no settlement at all of the principle for which we contend; it cuts the ground entirely away from the Government in their attitude to the Berlin Act in reference to the commercial basin of the Congo. One half of the Resolution which was unanimously passed by this House in reference to the affairs of the Congo State was concerned with the Concessions Régime in the Congo State. The House and the Government asserted that the Concessions Régime was a violation of the Berlin Act and that it was fatal to the future of that country. The French have repudiated that Régime in their own colony, our Government have protested against it; but they have not taken advantage of the present opportunity to formally protest against it. The words of the Berlin Act, 1884–5, Article 5, are clear. They are "against monopoly or favour of any kind in matters of trade. . . . No monopoly or privilege of any kind in commercial matters." The French delegate at Berlin, Baron de Courcel, explained these words in our sense, that they implied and included "trade in all products of the soil." When we find the Congo State, on the one hand, and a French Colony on the other, have defied that doctrine, it is surely fitting that the matter should be dealt with on a proper basis, instead of being left to be settled between the French Government and private firms in Liverpool. On 26th April the noble Lord the Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs said—

> "It was not found possible to include in an Agreement dealing with general questions of an international character the private claims to which reference is made. We understand that the principle is admitted; and the earnest hope of His Majesty's Government is that an equitable settlement might easily be arrived at."

That is that private interests are to be bought out. But that is not our point. Our point is that this is a breach of the Berlin Act, and that we should not, in the interests of British trade and of humanity, allow the matter to stand as it is. M. Roume, the Governor-General of French West Africa, has declared against the whole policy of the Concessions Régime, as had done, also, the gentleman who, first amongst all the colonial writers, M. Chailley-Bert, has changed his former view. This was a moment when, by a very small amount of diplomatic negotiation, we might have been able to take France with us instead of against us in dealing with the Congo State.

I wish to mention another matter in connection with this Bill which has been omitted, although I will not venture to deal with it at length. We have had actual trouble with France in regard to the misuse of the French flag in connection with the trade in arms and the running of slaves. It has been the practice of the French Government to give the protection of their flag and semi-citizenship to people engaged in these enterprises. Great trouble has been produced in Siam in that regard as well as on the East Coast of Africa. Since 1814–5 there has been continual friction on this question. A perfectly satisfactory treaty was signed with France in regard to the use of the French flag for running slaves, but it was to be kept secret and was never acted upon. But surely, when we remember the declarations made by the present Government; the language used in 1886–8; when we remember what was said in the Blue-books; the language used by Sir Arthur Hardinge in June, 1897; by Lord Salisbury in the House of Lords and by Lord Curzon in the House of Commons, as to the indiscrimate grant of the French flag to Arab craft, this opportunity should have been taken to settle this question of the misuse of the French flag. The French Government themselves admit this misuse of their flag. When Lord Curzon recently visited the Persian Gulf this matter came up. A very well-known gentleman, of almost international weight, who was with Lord Curzon—a correspondent of *The Times*, authorised as such by the Viceroy, used these words—

> "Lord Lansdowne had again brought the matter before the French Government."

So that the matter was under discussion between this Government and the French Government last year. He said—

> "The question of principle is to be referred to the Hague Tribunal."

If so, let the Government tell the House that that is the case. I am certain that it would be a most gratifying announcement that this question, which has cost so much friction in the past between this Government and the Government of France, is to be dealt with in that way. I do not know whether there is any authority for that statement, but it would remove one of the most dangerous of all the omitted subjects in this convention. I repeat that I welcome this convention as a whole. I re-echo the words of the right hon. Member for Northumberland that it is a State Paper of first-class importance;

I congratulate the Government on having brought the matter frankly before Parliament and for the encouraging language of the noble Lord in which I am sure the whole House agrees.

*MR. MOON (St. Pancras, N.): If the Government had attempted to deal with every point raised by the right hon. Member for Forest of Dean, there would have been risk of dangerous delay if not of failure in the negotiations instead of a success. In regard to Siam, in that country English is taught in all the leading schools. It is financially prosperous. It has no public debt. It has in its cash-box two millions sterling; including half a million of British Consols. It has 300 miles of railways, and if any difficulty were to occur between us and France in regard to Siam in the future, the fact that Germany has a large trade interest in that country would strengthen our situation. It may be in the recollection of hon. Members that recently two fleets of British merchant ships which traded with Siam passed under the German flag. A German was, or was till lately, at the head of the railway, and Germans have some of the largest rice-mills in the country. France, as well as ourselves, joined in the declaration of disclaming all idea of annexing Siamese territory. I think that hon. Members when they look at the declaration in Lord Lansdowne's despatch must feel satisfied that the Government have taken a perfectly reasonable course. My hon. friend the Member for King's Lynn spoke of this country having acquiesced in partitions of territory in respect of Siam and Morocco. Any hon. Member who will look at the map attached to the Convention of 1896 with France about Siam will, however, see that my hon. friend is in error when he suggests that the present treaty will bring the French sphere of influence right up to the eastern border of the Menam, because he loses sight of the fact that the guaranteed region stretches a very considerable distance to the east and west of the River Menam. Chantaboon has been mentioned; but the fact that M. Etienne is in favour of restoring Chantaboon to Siam shows that his intentions are not of a very aggressive character.

As regards Morocco, the statement that our trading rights are to remain undiminished and uninterfered with for thirty years will give very considerable comfort to every hon. Member. If I recollect aright what the First Lord of the Treasury has written on the subject, it is likely that by the time this treaty is at an end all European nations will have arrived at the conclusion that their present protective policy is superfluous; and, therefore, at the expiration of a generation from now we may expect France will have given up her protective ideas and that the proportion of our trade with Morocco, which is more than 50 per cent. of the whole trade of that country, will continue undiminished. I cannot, however, think of the history of Madagascar without feeling dissatisfaction; but that is balanced by the improved condition of our trade in Tunis, which was mentioned by my noble friend the Under-Secretary. Tunis was acquired by the French under somewhat similar conditions to those on which Madagascar was acquired. I think it is within the circle of European influence, and for that reason freer from monopoly than Madagascar. As regards Newfoundland, I think very few Members of this House realise the hardships which were inflicted on the natives of that island under the requirements which are now to come to a conclusion. In an article in *The Nineteenth Century* a few years ago, written by Mr. McGrath, a Newfoundland journalist, it is stated—

> "Every spring the French fleet visits Bay St. George, and a British warship compels the resident fishermen to supply them with bait at whatever figure the French offer, and even if American and Canadian vessels are there awaiting bait the residents will not be permitted by the warship to supply them until the French have been satisfied, even though they offer three times the price the French are paying."

Further, it is stated that Sir Baldwin Walker forcibly closed a British cannery. Again, there was another *modus vivendi*, which placed the monopoly of the lobster canning industry in the hands of those alone who had it before 1889. The result is described as follows—

> "All those who canned lobsters in defiance of the law were proclaimed as illicit packers, and the warships were sent to hunt them out,

destroy their factories, take away their implements, and confiscate their finished goods. That inhuman as well as unpatriotic procedure British cruisers had been pursuing even this season, until the condition of these wretched people has become deplorable in the extreme."

On the Treaty Coast the population has in the last decade increased from 10,000 to 14,000. Books of reference show that there are possibilities of lumbering and also of mining—industries which have been stopped because the French would not permit the construction of wharves or the sinking of shafts. In the Statesman's Year Book for 1904 it is stated that rich deposits have been discovered in the West Coast, and that coal of excellent quality has been found near St. George's Bay on the Treaty Shore. During the last decade the railway has been brought near the West Coast, although the French did all they could to oppose it. As to the demand of the French to claim exclusive rights on the West Coast, I do not know what jurist my hon. friend the Member for King's Lynn consulted; but the passage read by my hon. friend from the declaration of the Treaty of Versailles of 1783 shows to laymen at all events that the French had very reasonable grounds for making this exclusive claim; and it was not unreasonable that on a declaration of that kind the French did think they had an exclusive right. It was on that exclusive right that this sterilisation, as Lord Lansdowne called it, of two-fifths of the coast of Newfoundland has been based; and if we have gained the abolition of that sterilisation by the cession of a certain portion of territory in Africa which is valuable to the French but of no value to us, the result is highly to be applauded. The hon. Gentleman the Member for King's Lynn said the Amendment he had placed on the Paper suggested that the Government were not only making an Agreement behind the backs of third nations, but also an Agreement which would be disposed of by every British self-governing colony. As regards that, Mr. Seddon, on a public occasion recently, referring to the New Hebrides, expressed the satisfaction of New Zealand in regard to that portion of the convention; and in *The Times* of 23rd April the following cablegram from St. John's was published—

"There is unbounded enthusiasm over the French Shore Agreement. The schools are closed, the shipping is decorated, bonfires are to be lighted, and displays of fireworks will be given. One hundred and twenty Naval Reserves paraded to-day and there will be a parade of citizens to-night."

I think that shows that on the island principally affected, communications must have been kept up, although not perhaps in a rigidly formal manner, which kept the authorities here in touch with feeling on the island. The Motion of my hon. friend would hamper the Government in future transactions, and in their attempt to secure every possible advantage to this country. Only to-day it appears from the Paper which has been circulated that there was to be an English Consul at St. Pierre, a thing which Newfoundland wanted. If we went in for further supplementary small advantages we might seriously risk and delay and perhaps lose the great benefit to ourselves and to France which I believe this convention will confer.

Mr. ROBSON (South Shields): The debate this afternoon has been additional evidence, if additional evidence were needed, of the complete disappearance of that antagonistic racial feeling which has prevailed between this country and France for so many years. We were always thought to be not merely casual, but permanent enemies. It was always said that the absence of those ties of race and religion between France and ourselves, which unite us to Germany, necessarily made us the enemy of our nearest neighbour. But so far as the speakers who have taken part in this debate are concerned, that has turned out practically to be not the case. It is to be hoped that this will turn out to be a guarantee of working friendship between the two countries. There is in England an absolutely universal sentiment to remove not only every cause of friction with France but to go beyond that removal, and show France a temper not merely of equity and fairness, but of positive generosity. At the same time we have to remember there is a business element in this convention, and we could not do worse, even from the point of view of pure sentiment, than to ignore it, especially where, as in this case, the business element is something more than a mere question of petty national advantage. This business element does not concern England alone. It touched the most vital of all our Imperial and international objects of policy, which is the maintenance of the open door for our commerce and for the commerce of the world in the undeveloped markets of the world. The real gist of the Agreement consists in the surrender of our trading interests in Siam and Morocco. With regard to Newfoundland the French have made no substantial or any sacrifice at all. On the contrary they have made this treaty an occasion for reaffirming and improving their position in that country so far as it is a question of profit. For years they have kept alive this cause of difference and conflict in order that they might use it against us in diplomacy as they have now done. They have only been able to keep their fishing industry alive through subsidies. By this Agreement France obtains the privilege of purchasing bait, and in that regard improves her position. In addition to that England generously consents to pay an indemnity if France can show any pecuniary loss. There is nothing in the Agreement in regard to Newfoundland which justifies the sacrifice of any of our material interests in any other part of the world.

With regard to Egypt, England gets not a penny of material advantage, nor does France give any up. There is an abandonment on the part of France of the right to promote friction by the exercise of certain administrative restrictions upon the Egyptian Government. But what we have gained in regard to Egypt we might have gained in 1896. When we give up so much, we might benefit in England by some such restrictions upon the doings of the present Government. They were restrictions upon expenditure—an arrangement by which the Administration was compelled to pay its debts, and we might be grateful to Europe if they imposed such restrictions upon our Ministry. As regards Siam the speech of the noble Lord sounded almost like an echo of the speech made by Lord Curzon when dealing with the Treaty of 1896. It was understood then that we had made many sacrifices, and that the result was to be permanently good relations between us and France so far as Siam was concerned. I think I hear yet the careful exposition made in this House eight years ago, when it was pointed out that France always desired to come up to the eastern side of the Menam. We had allowed her to do so, and the question was not how far she should come, but when she should recede. The valley of the Menam, the heart of Siam, was to be carefully preserved to the unqualified independence of Siam. Neither England nor France has any right to interfere in the valley of the Menam. Now the Treaty of 1896 is to be treated as if it had never existed. Now France is to be able to use her influence right up to the valley of the Menam. I cannot imagine anything more likely to lead to conflict in the future than this treaty with regard to Siam. We are to have a sphere of influence in Siam, right up to the left bank of the Menam, and the influence of France is to extend up to the right bank. The effect of the arrangement will be that Siam will be subjected to the influence of two competing Powers, each of which claim the exclusive sphere of influence up to the banks of this river that runs through the heart of the empire. The effect of this will be to cause friction, and it seems to me as if France had no desire to remove any cause of conflict in the future.

Perhaps the most important feature of the whole treaty is the policy of the Government in regard to our trade rights in Morocco. Of course it will be said they have secured the permanence of our trade rights for a specified time, but at the end of that time we shall be entirely at the mercy of France. The policy of the Government in this respect is worthy of some consideration. It might be said to be a graceful concession, but these graceful concessions, so far as they go, always allowed France or some other nation to claim a commercial suzerainty over unconquered territories where we possess trade rights. These graceful concessions have always resulted in nations hostile to our commerce having complete control of our commerce. In Siam, Morocco, Madagascar, and Tunis, English commerce was supreme. But we know what has happened in these places. It is said that in Tunis there had been an increase in our commerce. That may be so, but the surrender of our position in Tunis was accompanied by an immediate reduction of duty on the main article we exported. In the case of Tunis there was a longer period for the continuance of the treaty —forty instead of thirty years—and a corresponding immediate advantage was given by way of a reduction of duty.

*EARL PERCY: Only, I think, until 1905 or 1906.

MR. ROBSON: Then this increase in our trade with Tunis may come to an end in 1905 or 1906; so that we have got even less than I supposed.

*EARL PERCY: I mean the concession as regards cotton goods.

MR. ROBSON: They are our principal export to Morocco. Out of £688,000 of cotton goods imported into Morocco, Lancashire sends £591,000. Imagine, therefore, what an ultimate advantage it would have been to Lancashire if there had been another such provision in the case of Morocco as there was in the case of Tunis for a reduction of duty. But there is nothing of the kind. All our Morocco trade is now to be under a "time limit." Ministers may think it is a considerable time, but thirty years is not a long period when dealing with the risks which accompany the opening out of new avenues of trade. You cannot run the national trade on the leasehold system. The risks of establishing new branches and of pushing our trade further into a country like Morocco are such that merchants will not willingly run for a mere temporary goodwill. They desire to establish their business on such a footing as will give them a goodwill which they can sell. Therefore it is little use for us to deal with this treaty as though we had obtained any substantial advantage, or any advantage when dealing as a matter of principle with any reservation of our treaty rights for thirty years. If France was willing, in the case of Tunis, for forty years, and in the case of Morocco for thirty years, to allow the existence of trade rights, why could we not put upon her that condition which she in Egypt puts upon us of allowing her trade rights and treaties go on in effect? But let us look at the trade of Morocco. The imports of Morocco amount to £1,700,000, of which we send no less than £930,000. That is a great trade to put at the mercy of a foreign country. It was a growing and a promising trade, and the effect of this Agreement will be to put a check on its immediate expansion. I do not say it will stop its immediate expansion, but it will put a check upon the rate of expansion, and place the trade under the prospect of ultimate extinction. The policy of giving up our trade rights, which this Government, if it has not initiated, has carried to an extent undreamt of by any other Administration, has seemed to some of us unintelligible; we have sometimes asked whether it is a policy at all, or simply diplomatic paralysis. Such a policy was not found necessary under Mr. Gladstone or Lord Rosebery; they at all events knew how to maintain the treaty rights of England without war or exciting general hostility.

A remarkable feature of the policy of this Government is that their concessions have been, not preceded, but followed by a condition of more general and more bitter hostility against England on the part of Europe than has been known in any former period of our history. Therefore, so far as conciliation is concerned, the policy of concessions without substantial equivalents does not seem to have been a success. And yet the Government are nursing it. Why? I think we are beginning to understand that it is part of the policy of the Government to care very little about the continuance of foreign trade. There is an ominous consistency between the domestic and the foreign policy of the Government in that regard. You cannot very well expect that they should be extremely eager to maintain foreign trade which they are constantly telling us is only a fit subject for penal taxation. What compensations are we to get in England for the prospective loss of our trade in Morocco? It appears that for one year at any rate—and one cannot help thinking it was in the mind of the Government—Morocco was a very serious competitor with English industry in the matter of jewellery. We did not know it at the time, but we have been assured on high authority that they did interfere with the industry of Birmingham to a degree which excited alarm and apprehension in the minds of those concerned in the jewellery trade. It is true that Lancashire may lose a trade worth £591,000 a year, but on the other hand England will get compensation in the number of persons who will be employed in making the jewellery which hitherto Morocco has sent here. In addition to that, I find that Morocco sends us goatskins, bees, and wax. Therefore Lancashire will get ample compensation for the loss of her trade of £591,000 with Morocco in the additional employment of the happy multitudes who will give themselves up to goats, bees, and the manufacture of wax. One sees at once the real justification for the surrender of our trade in Morocco. It is not a question of an *entente cordiale* with France at all; it is the removal of one of those sources of imports which are so dangerous to our commerce and peace. We see now before us the possibilities of a source of immense national wealth in the hedgerows of England, because when goatskins from Morocco are prohibited, an enormous impetus will be given to the production of goats, bees, and wax in England. ["Oh! Oh!"]. Some hon. Members appear to be shocked at the concrete application of the principles of which we have heard so much lately, but every question connected with international affairs has a fiscal bearing, and it is well that we should consider the advantage we are to gain.

There are two main reasons which tell upon the minds of Englishmen when they are asked—as they are so frequently asked by this Government—to sacrifice trade and national rights. The first is a prudential reason—that we should make any sacrifice rather than run the risk of war. War for trade rights frequently means an isolated war, in which we should be left to uphold the interests of universal trade at our own cost. The sacrifice of any trade advantage here or there is little indeed if it really purchases immunity from international conflict. But there is another reason which is even more creditable, viz., the dislike and distrust increasingly felt in England with regard to any policy which looks like one of selfishness on the part of our Empire. I would fifty times rather have a policy of weak concessions than a policy of greed and grab. A policy of grab is infinitely more dangerous than a policy of concession. It is the policy which this Government are always preaching, but their practice is confined to accepting the worst of any bargain that any nation makes with them. If the choice lay between a policy of weak concessions and a policy of national greed, I would not hesitate to welcome every concession. But those two extremes do not exhaust the alternatives. There is the policy of the maintenance by international concert of the trade rights not only of England but of the whole world in the great undeveloped markets of the earth. That is the policy which the Government have failed to remember. It is a policy noble in itself; you cannot call it selfish, because although it is best for our interests it founds those interests on the interests of mankind. The policy of international action is full of hope for the peace of mankind. It will be said that it is difficult of accomplishment. Everything is difficult to the inert, but I contend that the facilitating of international concert in defence of commercial rights is an object which any Government should have in view. The present Government, however, have completely neglected it. An illustration of what may be done by international concert is to be found in the case of Egypt, though I do not say that Egypt is an example I should like to see followed in all respects elsewhere. What is it that secures free trade in Egypt? It is not merely the fact that free trade is our universal policy? We might reverse the whole of our free-trade policy to-morrow, but we should still be unable to secure for ourselves a differentiation of trade rights in Egypt, because we have deliberately and, as I think, wisely chosen to recognise in Egypt certain international rights and treaties; we have made them the condition of our occupation of the country, and there is no reason at all why the same condition should not be attached to the occupation by France of Tunis and Morocco. It is idle to pretend that France would not allow such a condition to attach because it would conflict with her general system of protection. If she refused to accept it we should need to pay little attention to her complaints of our position in Egypt. The interests of Italy in Tunis and of Spain in Morocco gave us an opportunity of establishing exactly that international concert that we want in such a case. The co-operation we ought to have invited from those Powers would have been the beginning of the recognition of rights which are common to all. Therefore we have missed an opportunity of identifying our diplomacy with a really great policy not merely national but international, and founded upon the recognition of the rights of mankind as well as the rights of England. With very little skill and a little more courage we could have maintained what we have lost without giving an equivalent in so many of the great markets of the world.

Perhaps it is scarcely fair to expect such enthusiasm on the part of this Government for open ports when we know that they are so extremely anxious to close our ports at home. That argument may have affected their minds, although they do not know it. Possibly they are acting upon their domestic policy in their international relations without being conscious of it. I think that is the frame of mind the Prime Minister would desire to see this Parliament in. We are entitled on this side of the House to claim that our international policy should be in accord and in sympathy with our domestic policy. Do not let it be supposed, when we are talking here about the good relations we are establishing with France, that we are running no risk elsewhere. We have not consulted Spain or Germany, and we have left Spain to make its own arrangement with Morocco. Is there not a strong likelihood that Spain may seek territorial advantages to counterbalance the gain given to France, and that those advantages may be to the detriment of England? Spain may do that on her own account, and it will be still more injurious to us if she does it in conjunction with France. I think the sympathies of England and of the Liberal Party are not of a narrow or sectional character in regard to any of these international arrangements. We do not desire to seek an inequitable or selfish advantage; but we do desire that the Government should endeavour to maintain by every means in its power the commercial rights of the whole world both in Morocco and Tunis as in Eygpt. What this country submitted to in Egypt it might not unjustly call upon other nations to submit to elsewhere.

*Mr. JOSEPH WALTON (Yorkshire, W.R., Barnsley): The question which the House has now under consideration is one that may prove to have very far-reaching results. We gather from the communication from the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to the Minister in Paris that the Anglo-French Agreement is intended to secure the complete settlement of a series of important questions in which the interests of Great Britain and France are involved. We all welcome most heartily the conclusion of an Agreement bringing about closer and more friendly relations between this country and France on equitable lines, and, as previous speakers have stated, we are prepared to make even generous concessions to secure so desirable a result. It is, however, our duty when a Bill of this nature is submitted for the consideration of the House to make some examination of its provisions in order to arrive at a conclusion as to whether or not the objects which His Majesty's Government have before them have been really secured. We ought to remember the comments of the French Press in regard to the conclusion of this Agreement. Some of the most important papers in France have declared their opinion in regard to its provisions. The *Journal des Débats* says—

> "France surrenders nothing of importance but obtains most momentous concessions."

Another French paper, *La Lanterne*, regards the conclusion of the Agreement as a triumph for French diplomacy; and *Le Petit Parisien* says—

> "France abandons none of her actual rights, and only consents to the recognition of acquired possessions."

Then, again, regard must be had to the statement of M. Delcassé as to the object he had in view when negotiating this Agreement, and as to how far, in his opinion, French interests have been conserved and protected. With reference to the arrangement arrived at in respect to Egypt, M. Delcassé says that there has been no change in the political situation and that the main interest of the negotiations relates to the financial arrangements. M. Delcassé notes with special satisfaction the clause as to the free use of the Suez Canal and the adhesion of Great Britain to the execution of the Treaty of 29th October, 1888. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that in return for a very slight concession to us on the part of France of the right of the Egyptian Government to employ certain surplus funds as they may desire, we have conceded to France practically the protectorate of Morocco, to do whatever she pleases there. With regard to Morocco, M. Delcassé says—

> "Of all the questions involving French interests none, in fact, can be compared in importance with the Moroccan question. It is evident that upon its solution depended the solidity and development of our African Empire, and even the future of our situation in the Mediterranean. We have obtained a result on the importance of which it would be superfluous to insist."

Up to now British and French interests in this respect have been practically upon an equality. Whereas we had before permanently the benefit of the most-favoured-nation clause with Morocco, we have that limited under this Agreement to the next thirty years. With regard to Tunis, our arrangement with France expires in 1906, and in that year our trade with the French colony of Tunis will be still further hindered by increased tariffs on the goods we send there. This Government is a Government which professes the greatest possible interest about the future of British trade and commerce. It is a Government possessing a retaliationist Prime Minister and some of its members are protectionists. They have told the country and the House that what we need to gain greater facilities for British trade in various parts of the world is the power to negotiate and the power to bargain. In this arrangement with France we had a great deal in our hands with which to bargain. Hon. Members have heard the statement of M. Delcassé as to the enormous importance which the French nation attached to the concessions we have made in regard to Morocco. There is another provision in regard to Egypt and Morocco which is eminently satisfactory as affecting British trade, and I desire to consider this Anglo-French Agreement mainly from the point of view as to how far British commercial interests in the future are likely to be advanced by these provisions and how far the Government have omitted to secure other concessions which they might reasonably have been expected to secure, and which would have benefited still further British trade. The further stipulation in regard to Egypt and Morocco is that French and English trade with Morocco and with Egypt shall enjoy the same treatment in transit through French and British possessions in Africa. But I would ask what efforts have been made to come to a similar equitable arrangement in regard to the transit of French and British goods through French and British territories in Western Africa. I also wish to know whether the Government have taken into account the serious hindrance to British trade in Western China and Siam which arises from the fact that the French Government impose a transit duty of 10 per cent. on all British goods passing through Tonquin to South-West China and certain portions of Siam. If it was equitable to make this arrangement in regard to Egypt and Morocco, why cannot we have the same arrangement in regard to South-West China in respect of which we have a definite Agreement with the French Government, entered into in 1894, under which each nation pledges itself to use its good offices to facilitate its equal rights and privileges in regard to trade? Therefore it is extremely disappointing that His Majesty's Government have failed to secure the abandonment on the part of France of this imposition of a 10 per cent. tariff on British goods passing through Tonquin to South-West China and Siam in the same way in which they have secured a concession in regard to Morocco. Not only is this true of Siam and South-West China, but it is equally true of Western Africa, where British traders have been very much hindered by the curtailment of their just trading rights, and certainly in regard to this His Majesty's Government have not upheld the interests of British traders as they ought to have done. We give to France the treatment that our own trade receives throughout our world-wide Empire. Why, then, should a similar arrangement with France have been confined to Morocco alone, and not extended to other French colonial possessions? Surely our retaliatory Prime Minister might have devoted himself to securing better terms for British trade with France itself. The fact is that we take an enormous amount of imports from France, and, with the present friendly feeling between the two nations, surely during the negotiation of this Agreement there was a golden opportunity for the Government securing in a much fuller degree than they have done facilities for British trade with France and with the French colonial possessions. So far from having done that, they have absolutely acquiesced in the extinction of our trading rights in Madagascar for evermore. Our trade there was 95 per cent. some time ago, but since the French occupation it has dwindled down to 5 per cent. We are told that our trade with Tunis has increased, but the development of Tunis has gone on, and no one will make me believe that, but for the increased tariffs imposed on British goods, our trade there would not have increased in a greater degree than it has done.

Broadly, the commercial aspects of this Anglo-French Agreement are extremely disappointing, because an exceptional opportunity was afforded for negotiating better terms. There can be no shadow of doubt that we have made most important concessions to France, and the complaint is that His Majesty's Government have failed to secure in return anything like a *quid pro quo*. I say this in no sense in a hostile way to the Anglo-French Agreement. We would rather have it, very much against our interests as it is, than not have it at all, because it is a great guarantee for the peace of the world and the progress of civilisation to have such a friendly arrangement between two great neighbouring Powers. But when we come to examine it we find where the defects are. Take the question of fishing rights. We have given to France permanently concurrent fishing rights off the coast of Newfoundland. But what about the rights of our fishermen on the Los Islands? There our rights are granted for thirty years only. The Government decline to put a time limit in the Licensing Bill, but they put a time limit in these valuable treaty arrangements all over the world. In the case of Tunis we see how soon they run out and we see the disadvantage of having our trade hindered and hampered by still higher tariffs. In regard to the fishing rights off Newfoundland M. Delcassé, referring to the new Agreement, says—

> "We have only abandoned privileges in Newfoundland which were difficult to defend and in no way necessary, while we have preserved the essential feature—namely, the right of fishing in the territorial waters of Newfoundland, and have established for the future beyond all doubt a valuable right, that of fishing for and purchasing bait without hindrance along the whole extent of the French shore."

And yet in return for their abandoning what was not necessary our Government have given these large concessions of territory in West Africa, and the cession of the Iles de Los. M. Delcassé says that the concessions received in West Africa—

> "are of considerable importance for the development of our colonial possessions. As to Konakry, which promises to be one of the great commercial emporiums on the coast, the key of that port is now in French hands. The Agreement has effected a transformation greatly to the advantage of France, of the whole frontier of the region between the Niger and Lake Chad. This constitutes a considerable accession of territory by France in those regions and may prove of great importance for the development of the French possessions in Africa."

I do not object to these cessions of territory in West Africa to France, but I think the Government ought to have secured larger mutual concessions in return. In return for the cession of the Iles de Los they should at least have had as a set-off the Islands of Miquelon and St. Pierre, off the coast of Newfoundland. These still remain in the hands of France, and I can assure His Majesty's Government, from information which I have received, that there is a strong opinion held in Canada, and among the inhabitants of Newfoundland, that this settlement is not by any means satisfactory. The question is, and I think the House has a right to know, whether His Majesty's Government made every possible effort to secure what would be a mutually equitable and satisfactory arrangement such as I have indicated. At any rate, in the absence of any such agreement, we cannot but feel that British diplomacy has again been worsted. It seems always unfortunately to be the case when our diplomatists are brought into discussion with foreign diplomatists we somehow come off second best, and this, so far as our commercial interests are concerned, appears to be the case now. It is surprising that a better result has not been obtained by a Government which professes to take such a deep interest in the promotion of the trade and commerce of the country and who tell us that unless we can have better conditions and lower tariffs to facilitate our trade all over the world, the country is sure to go to the dogs. If that is their real belief I do not know why they should not have embraced this golden opportunity of, at any rate, using their bargaining powers, in getting from France much more as a *quid pro quo* for the concessions France has received under the Agreement just concluded.

*SIR ALBERT ROLLIT (Islington, S.): Having for some years taken an interest in the policy which has just culminated in this convention and treaty, I desire to say a few words, especially of congratulation to the two Governments of England and France, and also in connection with the work which has been done by chambers of commerce. The right hon. Baronet the Member for Forest of Dean said that these treaties were a new departure; I venture to say that such is not the case as far as the commercial communities in France and England are concerned. I remember so long ago as 1895 being present at a gathering of many representatives of chambers of commerce in Bordeaux, and on that occasion the first intimations of the possibility of this *rapprochement* were made which have ultimately been fulfilled, and, in fact, I think we may say, paraphasing the words of a distinguished Frenchman, spoken at the Chamber of Commerce at Bordeaux, that commerce is peace, and that the chambers of commerce have materially contributed to what has ensued. One or two of the hon. Members who have spoken have seriously asked the question, Has the Government done its best for the ends in view? Is it possible that any British Government should do otherwise, having regard at all times to the difficulty of coming to an arrangement and to the wisdom of not risking the result by imitating the Dutch in asking too much? I think the feeling of the House was admirably expressed by the hon. Member for Morpeth when he said that we must look in these matters not so much to particulars as to the general object in view, especially when it means not only the welfare and goodwill of the two nations, but probably at this moment the peace of the world. From that point of view I do not doubt, and I know that I speak the views of chambers of commerce, that not only has the best been done but that it is owing to the spirit of give and take that the result has been brought about at all—a policy of fair and frank friendship with France and Frenchmen, which we desire. I think it was my right hon. friend opposite who dwelt on omissions from this treaty of what might have been obtained. May I remind the House that if there are difficulties still left open, if there are possibilities of differences in the future, there is an element which in the course of the discussion has never been mentioned, but which has a most important bearing on the position to-day and hereafter, and that is the arbitration treaty which has been effected between France and England. Not only have many differences been removed, but the means of preventing, at any rate, hostile action with regard to differences in the future has been achieved. Yes, the force of right will now supplant the right of force, the barriers will fall down between nation and nation and be set up only between right and wrong. Many compliments have most rightly been paid to others during the debate, but so far not one to M. Cambon, the representative of France in this country, to whom we are under deep obligation. He has been perpetually moving between his own country and London, and it is to his ability, tact, and good offices very much of the result attained has been due. I think that both countries are under great obligation to M. Cambon for the manner in which this treaty has been negotiated, and I also venture to say that there is another name, to which no reference has been made, but which has been a most important factor in the result. It should be mentioned in the House to-day, and that is the name of the President of the French Republic, M. Loubet. I know well how deep the interest M. Loubet has had in this compact of concord and amity in its relation to the future of his own nation as well as to that of this country. I know how he spoke to myself of his reception in this country—that it was profoundly most touching to himself and useful to the cause which he had at heart. Another French statesman must also be mentioned in this connection, M. Millerand. The British chambers of commerce which visited France in 1900, in its great Exhibition year, were received with a great welcome and hospitality by the President of the Republic and his Minister of Commerce, M. Millerand, and the larger intercourse which has since taken place between the two countries has undoubtedly contributed to the result we speak of to-day. Whatever we may say as to the result of the passing of the Bill now before the House, permanent peaceful relations between the two countries have been accomplished and accomplished chiefly through commerce and the commercial classes of the two peoples. Not only are France and England close neighbours, but in trade they stand more largely in the relation of mutual customers rather than competitors as in the case of England and Germany. The difference of climate and natural products leads each nation to supply the wants of the other; and when my friend who spoke last expressed the hope that we should have some relaxation of the high protective tariff of France, I would remind him that we may secure that, as a corollary of this convention, not so much by retaliatory methods but by means of commercial reciprocity by treaty, such as was accomplished by Cobolu's commercial treaty of 1860, which doubled in a decade the trade between this country and France. So that even if we lose something in Morocco or Madagascar we open a wider commercial horizon in greater commercial union and unity between France and England by this great plan for the improvement of international relations.

On the details of the convention I should like to make a few observations. As to Egypt, any one who has read the recent report of Lord Cromer must recognise that the financial restriction on the use of the reserve fund, etc., has impeded many necessary reforms and productive works. Speaking from personal knowledge and observation in Egypt—and I know that this is the view of the British Chamber of Commerce in Alexandria—many port improvements could have been effected if the triple administration had been abolished. May I say that I regret that the Mixed and Consular Tribunals in Egypt have not been dealt with in this convention, and that I hope that the Tribunals in Egypt will soon deal with their own cases, as in Japan, where the judicial example set by England has been productive of the greatest good. I would have wished that the Mixed and Consular Tribunals had been replaced by an administration of native Judges as in other countries. As to Morocco, though there is a time limit of thirty years, I take it that what could be done was done. There is internal evidence that great care has been taken in dealing for instance with dues and taxes and with charges for railway transport on equal terms and with the coasting trade, often a great cause of injustice to British shipping as in the United States. In regard to Newfoundland, it has been said over and over again that we have got nothing in exchange. The answer to that is that we have got a surrender of the shore rights, and of the right of the French to land and dry fish, after several attempts to jettison the old lumber of the Treaty of Utrecht, which is as dead as Queen Anne who made it. The hon. Member for King's Lynn rightly pointed out that these shore rights had been one great obstacle to the development of Newfoundland. In addition, the right of free fishing is maintained, and there is a provision for a close-time for different kinds of fish and as to the modes of fishing. The case of Siam is perhaps the least satisfactory element of the convention, and I hope that the references which are constantly made as to maintaining the integrity of that progressive and prosperous country will be insisted upon. I agree with the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean that the trade with Siam directly and indirectly through Singapore and Hong-Kong, is of vast importance. But apart from that the Siamese people have a strong claim upon our consideration and sympathy. But there seems to be some singular misconception as to the exact terms of the treaty in reference to the French and English spheres of influence in Siam. It is most undesirable that that should be so. It is almost likely to lead to misapprehension, if not something more, in the future. The integrity of Siam is, and ought to be, assured, and I have no sympathy with those speakers who have said that such sovereign States as Siam, Persia, etc., ought to be ignored by the great Powers. Such integrity is declared to be regarded, as are our present treaty rights to favoured-nation treatment. The wording of the convention and treaty as to the boundary of French and English spheres of influence is vague, the terms basin, zone, region, and valley of the Menam being alternately used, and this might lead to future differences; indeed, one construction of the words of the Under-Secretary (Lord Percy), viz., that the river banks are the boundaries, which the hon. Member for South Shields said is possible, that Bangkok itself being on the east bank of the Menam was in the French sphere, but there must be some misapprehension as to this. At any rate, these points should be made clear, and free from dubiety and difference. In regard to Madagascar, what have we surrendered by this treaty except futile protest against the protective fiscal and exclusive policy of the French nation? Merely a verbal protest against conquest and a consequent exclusive tariff effected years ago, to which there is a counterpoise given as in Zanzibar. Under all the circumstances, and for greater ends than any in Madagascar or Morocco, peace and goodwill, and I hope expanding intercourse and trade with France, I cordially support the treaty and conventions and the Bill now proposed to ratify them in the true interest of the two progressive, and most civilised and cultured nations of Europe.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): I have no desire to act as a lightning conductor and to bring down prematurely the final fulminations and the play of sheet lightning of the Prime Minister. I have, equally, little desire to add to the length of this discussion. The most remarkable feature of this debate is that there has not been a single discordant note as to the main purport and object of the convention. A number of my hon. friends and Gentlemen on the other side of the House have found fault with the details of the arrangement which has been made; but I take the position, following the line of my right hon. friend the Member for Berwick, in saying that this is something more than a bargain between two competitive nations. It is an arrangement to dispose of certain possible grounds of difficulty in the future, and to get out of the way elements of discord between them. It is from that point of view that I think we ought to regard it. When we look into the details I do not think it is very difficult to find many blemishes, omissions, and possibly errors in the particulars of the convention. I think hon. Members to-night have pointed out several, and there is great force in what they urge, especially as to the apparent failure to safeguard the trade rights of this country, especially in Siam and Morocco. When we remember what has happened in Madagascar, Tunis, and several cases, we become more sensitive on that point. I wish to ask a question, not a trade question, with regard to Morocco. I have received a letter from those who have the control of certain schools in Morocco, and who are very anxious to know what the effect of the new relations will be upon them. The letter says—

> "In Egypt it is stipulated that the Roman Catholic schools and missions are to remain free, with liberty to carry on their work, while in Morocco the Protestant schools and missions, which have been in existence for over twenty years, are altogether ignored. So those of our faith who have an interest in the country and have laboured long in Morocco feel themselves now in a trying position, as France has preponderance in Morocco, and there is great cause for fear that what has taken place in Madagascar will be repeated in Morocco, and we shall be either expelled or our work so hindered that it will be impossible to carry it on."

I think that point, although comparatively a small one, requires to be attended to, and I hope it has not escaped the consideration of the Government, although there is no absolute provision regarding it. But all these considerations are swallowed up when we contemplate this Agreement as a great instrument for bringing together two neighbouring nations and two old rivals—two nations that have been separated by what has been believed to be inborn, hereditary enmity—and for promoting friendship and co-operation between the two nations—I do not wish to speak invidiously about other nations—but probably the two nations of Europe most identified with progress and freedom. It has always seemed to me to be a most extraordinary thing that there should be a feeling of jealousy and almost antipathy encouraged between France and England, when really they are the two nations of all others that ought to go hand in hand in the work of civilising and developing the world. That, fortunately, we have no longer to regret. I do not know whether it is possible accurately to apportion the credit for this improvement. The King in this country and the President in France, the Ambassadors and Foreign Ministers on both sides all deserve our thanks for the part they have taken, and we all appreciate their wise and earnest action in this matter. I share the hope, freely expressed in this debate, that this arrangement with France may be a model for other arrangements with other countries, and an example of the way in which those traditional differences, which sometimes may be acute, but which are also sometimes in themselves almost on the verge of being absurd, can be disposed of when good will and the desire to be friends prevail instead of that jealousy and rivalry with which we have all sometimes been puzzled. The House will echo the general feeling of the country, which is one of intense satisfaction, at the conclusion of this convention.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: The debate this afternoon, which has throughout been of a very friendly character, began with two speeches of rare ability and rare elevation of tone. We could hardly expect the general tenor of the debate to remain throughout at that high level; and, although the right hon. Gentleman, in the speech which he has just delivered, returned to that high level, there was no doubt between his speech and those opening speeches, in addition to a general congratulation on the conclusion of this Agreement, a certain amount of criticism, which I will not characterise as petty, but which certainly seemed to me to be hardly worthy of the occasion on which it was delivered. It is natural enough that when an arrangement is made between two countries there should be—there must and always will be—room for the critics in each country to suppose that it has got the worst of the bargain and to suggest that the other country has somehow or other succeeded in outwitting the feeble diplomacy and the poor powers of bargaining displayed by the Ministry criticised. The method in which that criticism is pursued is also the same in both countries. An hon. Gentleman opposite read out extracts from the speeches of M. Delcassé and other important members of the French Government explaining how great the advantages of this arrangement were to France. He founds upon that the inquiry, If this arrangement is really so good for France, if France got so much advantage, why did you not get a lot more? But supposing the debates in the two countries had been inverted and the debate in the House of Commons had come before the debate in the French Chamber, and even the very moderate statement made by my noble friend near me had been first criticised by a critic in the French Chamber, could he not have said, there has been a debate in the House of Commons and it has been pointed out how greatly England gained by this Agreement. How came you to make such a wretched bargain when you had such a felicitous opportunity? That is one trait which is almost inseparable from this kind of debate. Another trait is the criticism of the hon. Gentleman who looks at the arrangements from the point of view of their inadequacy. Something more might have been done; and always the something more that might have been done is the particular thing in which he takes an interest. The hon. and learned Member for South Shields delivered a speech in which the only matter that appeared to touch him was the question of tariffs; and an hon. Gentleman beside him, I think, also talked at some length about tariff negotiations which we might have brought to a successful issue. I am glad to hear from that quarter that negotiations sometimes can improve tariffs; but I would seriously point out that this was not fundamentally, primarily, or essentially a tariff negotiation. The question of tariffs only arose in connection with Morocco and in respect to Madagascar. An hon. Member told us that we had given up most valuable British rights in abandoning a remonstrance vainly made since the French annexed Madagascar. In these eight eventful years the international relations of France and this country have gone through more than one change; and in no phase of them, I venture to say, was there the slightest practical prospect of the French giving in on that point. And what lever had we to compel them to give in? Short of war, we had none. We could not use tariff negotiation, which, it seems to me, might be the appropriate method of dealing with a purely tariff difficulty. No other way was open.

Let us take the case of Morocco. Hon. Members got themselves in very low spirits over the fact that this treaty in regard to our commercial relations with Morocco will only last for a generation. They truly say that a generation is not very long in the history of a nation; but it is a considerable time in the history of a commercial arrangement; and I am not sure that if you make the time of indefinite length it would not with the lapse of years lose that vitality and concreteness which a definite arrangement always gives to a treaty. There is a point at which, not by the law of nations, but by the practice of nations, many treaties become practically obsolete in their provisions. [An HON. MEMBER dissented.] My hon. friend doubts that. I will not dispute the point with him. But during a time limit a treaty obviously must be enforced. It is impossible to say that things have so changed as to alter the situation. But putting that general argument on one side, I would ask whether there has ever been a better bargain made by any Government with regard to a country in the condition of Morocco than the bargain we have made. I do not believe a case could be quoted from our diplomatic annals of a bargain half as carefully thought out, half as protective of trade interests, being added to the long list of international arrangements. I may be wrong, because this is not a point on which I have guarded myself by express investigation, but I should be greatly surprised if it were possible to quote any convention in contradiction of the proposition I have laid down.

I do not think it would really be desirable for me to go through all the criticisms that have been passed on the details of this treaty. But I may say, perhaps, with regard to Siam that surely criticism has been carried to an excessive point, seeing that we have simply repeated the provisions of the Treaty of 1896, not altering it in any way beyond, as I think, making an arrangement which will make it clear for the future and which will demarcate those parts of Siam in which we have a right to interfere as between the Siamese and the French and those parts in which we have no such right. Under this Agreement there are parts of Siam where we can make arrangements with the Siamese with which the French will have nothing to do, and, again, there are other parts of the country where it will be open to France and Siam to come to agreement in regard to which we shall have nothing to say. Then there is a third portion which is regarded as a matter of common interest as between the two countries, and in which we engage in no way to interfere with each other. This is perfectly clear and definite and extremely reasonable in the exceptional position of that country, and I cannot imagine any other plan better calculated to prevent international wrangling over that part of the Far Eastern question. I do not say that any arrangement can make wrangling impossible; that I do not pretend; but that a better arrangement than this can be made I have the very gravest doubt. The same right hon. Gentleman who raised the question of Siam raised the question of certain commercial rights on the French Congo, giving an admirable illustration of what I said earlier—that everybody goes for the particular thing in which he is interested, and says that should have been done before you came to the final arrangement. I am not going to discuss these matters; individual interests are practically safeguarded, not by this treaty, but by separate arrangements with the French Government. I think it would have been perfect folly to drag into the negotiations with France the question of the true interpretation to be put upon the Treaty of Berlin, which might have imperilled the whole negotiations, and which certainly had no great relevancy to any of the burning issues between the two countries. The right hon. Baronet raised a more important point when he referred to French rights in Muscat.

*Sir CHARLES DILKE: Not only in Muscat, but all along the coast, right up to Zanzibar.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: The right hon. Gentleman quoted a statement that an Agreement had been made with the French Government last year.

*Sir CHARLES DILKE: No, not last year. I referred to a much older Agreement.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I am referring to what happened last year, and what he rightly supposed had happened between the two Governments. It is quite true that last year a very difficult question arose between the French Government and ourselves which was not mentioned in the Press, or made matter of public discussion, though it presented many aspects of great difficulty at the moment. I am glad to say that question has by common consent been referred to The Hague tribunal for decision. I do not know whether there are any other points I need deal with in the way of smaller criticisms of these arrangements, but I must say a word on the general view of our foreign policy in recent years presented to the House by the right hon. Baronet. He is a great authority on this subject, to whom the House always listens with attention, but I confess myself utterly unable to follow his statement in this particular connection. He described this treaty as a complete reversal of Lord Salisbury's foreign policy. I am unable to attach any intelligible meaning to these words. He further went on to suggest it was wholly inconsistent with any understanding or agreement with Germany.

*Sir CHARLES DILKE: I said a policy of direct alliance with Germany as a military Power.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I will not go the length of saying no one ever suggested it, but I do not remember any such suggestion, and I am sure it never formed any integral portion of Lord Salisbury's policy. I entirely deny there has been any reversal of the traditional policy of our Party. I entirely deny that anything has been done prejudicial to the interests of Germany or any other Power. It would indeed be a blot upon our Agreement with France, from which we hope so much for the peace and amity of the world, if it were regarded as a stumbling-block in the way of similar arrangements with other Powers in other parts of the world. I think I need hardly add to that reply to the criticisms that have been delivered, except to say that during this debate there has been, except on the part of the right hon. Baronet, a great lack of appreciation of the enormous international benefits which the Newfoundland Agreement will give us. It is not merely that we have done a great deal to free Newfoundland from the shackles which, so long as the Treaty of Utrecht remained unmodified, necessarily hampered the development of the colony, but so long as these provisions were in existence peace between France and England seemed almost to hang by a thread. I firmly believe that nothing but the tact of French and British naval officers on the spot, their unceasing vigilance, their resolute determination to allow no petty irritating friction to develop into a running sore, have made the Utrecht arrangement tolerable through all these long years. It has been a source of perpetual anxiety to all Governments, an anxiety that did not appear in Blue-books, and naturally and rightly was not referred to in public speeches, but which yet was never absent from the minds of any men responsible for the conduct of the foreign affairs of this country. That perpetual menace has now, I am glad to think, been removed, I believe, for ever. Though it is quite true we should have preferred, as Newfoundland would have preferred, to see the last remnants of the Treaty of Utrecht swept away, yet the few traces of it that still remain are not of a kind ever likely to produce difficulty either between the colonists and ourselves or between the colonists and the French Government.

It has been said with great truth both by the Leader of the Opposition and by the right hon. Baronet the Member for Berwick, that we must not look at this treaty merely as a bargain. It is true that as a bargain it has this enormous advantage, that, like all good bargains, it is advantageous to both sides. It is an advantage for this reason, that what the French give up and what we give up principally consists in the power of hampering the natural and free development and action of the other, and what each gains is the power of exercising to the utmost that freedom and that power of development, whether it be in Egypt, Newfoundland, or Morocco. The gain is incalculable; the loss is nothing, for it is simply giving up a national asset which could be used as a means of bargaining, but which in itself makes no Frenchman and no Englishman richer or happier, and which makes neither France nor England more powerful or more prosperous. That is the element in this arrangement which may be regarded, if you like, from the lower plane of profit and loss, but it is of incalculable value because it is in its nature perfect. We are told that we have given up a great deal in Morocco; but I ask any Gentleman, on whichever side of the House he sits, whether he contemplates with equanimity a struggle, diplomatic in the first instance, possibly not always diplomatic—a constant struggle at the Court of the Sultan of Morocco for the next generation, which, I venture to say, from the natural advantages possessed by France and England respectively, could not end to our advantage? It could not end, even if we so desired, in giving us a preponderating influence in Morocco which we could permanently maintain. We could have struggled for it and have used every diplomatic instrument in our power to maintain it; we could have hampered French designs in other quarters; we could have produced a great deal of ill-feeling between the two countries; but I have no doubt that France, conterminous as she is with an enormous frontier, would be a growing Power, and we, probably, a diminishing Power. Who would gain by it? We obviously not, and France obviously not. Is it not incomparably better to come to some arrangement like that embodied in this treaty? I have over and over again, so far as my voice would carry, told the House and the public, and particularly the public, that the great dangers to the peace of the world lie in the relations between semi-civilised States of the world—if I may use the term without offence—at all events non-Christian, Oriental States on the one side, and the great Western Powers on the other. They always play off one Power against another, and in the friction which then ensues the risks of collision are enormous and the gains problematical and very often visionary. One of these countries we have, at all events, entirely put out of the category I have described as being a danger to European peace, and in doing so I am convinced that not only have we not sacrificed any British interest whatever, but if we look to commerce alone—commerce, which can only flourish in a country where the elements of good government, peace, and order prevail—if we look to this, British interests have been greatly aided in Morocco, while certainly no territorial ambition any sane Englishman could possess has been spoiled. Well, then I turn from Morocco to Egypt, and were I addressing a French Assembly I could make precisely the same observations about Egypt as I have just made about Morocco. The French had great power to hamper us in Egypt, as we had power to hamper them in Morocco; more than that they did not possess; more than that and the great sentimental interest in a country which they had done so much to develop they did not possess. Is it not far better for us and also for them that we should clear the situation and that we should obtain the liberty in Egypt we are glad to accord to them in Morocco? These appear to me to be the broad grounds why, on the mere profit-and-loss account, this is one of the greatest international transactions of which we have record; and if we add to that all the other advantages so eloquently brought before the House in the speeches of my noble friend and the right hon. Baronet the Member for Berwick, if we look at the dangers to the peace of the world which are removed, if we consider what a load of anxiety is lifted from the minds of those who are responsible for the conduct of foreign affairs, and how great administrators like Lord Cromer have been freed from the perpetual worry which has hampered them in the execution of great philanthropic and administrative projects, then I venture to think that what is, after all, in spite of criticism, the common verdict of both sides of the House and the universal opinion of the country, will receive the seal of historical approval, and that this great instrument will be looked back upon as the beginning of a new and happier era in our international relations.

*MR. EMMOTT (Oldham); I merely wish to make one or two remarks on two points. In the first place I think that the Prime Minister has treated with unnecessary acerbity some of the criticisms of detail which have been passed on the convention.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I apologise.

*MR. EMMOTT: I only said that because we were appealed to by the noble Lord in his very able speech to look at the broad issues which lay before us rather than the minute details. I think that hon. and right hon. Gentlemen are agreed that whether "honours are easy," or whether the French have got a little more than we have, or whether we have got a little more than the French, is not the main point at issue. The main point is that there should be a settlement of a large number of questions which have caused difficulties and which might at any moment lead us into dangers from which there would be no escape without serious consequences. The noble Lord took an even wider view. He expressed the hope that the treaty will be the forerunner of a period when great nations may collaborate in the development of their respective territories, and of a period when suspicion will not be the chief factor in international relations. On this point I will only express the hope that this treaty may be the precedent for many others, and that the spirit in which the treaty has been received by both sides of the House will always be the spirit in which such treaties will be received. The real value of this treaty is that it is not only a treaty between Governments but also a treaty cordially acquiesced in by two peoples.

The other point I wish to speak about is the question of the French Congo. I am bitterly disappointed at the cursory way in which the right hon. Gentleman has passed that question over. The right hon. Gentleman said that it might have caused an upset of the whole arrangement if the question of the interpretation of the Berlin Treaty had been dragged in. That might have been said about anything. The fact remains that it is a great pity it has not been dealt with. The only reason that made me rise at this hour of the afternoon is because I desire to give expression to the view that nothing that the Government has said shows that they have a real grasp of the situation as it appears to some of us. There is a two-fold question. There is the question of the territory in which free trade does not obtain. There I admit English traders have been turned out, their goods have been confiscated, and their treatment may be treated as a matter of private right. But when we come to the free-trade zone the matter is altogether on a different basis. The Government have committed themselves to the view expressed in the Paper I hold in my hand, a Paper addressed to the Powers of Europe, and it states the opinion of the Government that the system of trade now existing in the Independent State of the Congo is not in harmony with the provisions of Articles I. and V. of the Berlin Act. The system in the French Congo is the same as in the Congo Free State, and it cannot be met by making compensating grants to individuals who happen to be unfairly treated; it can only be met by international agreement. I regret very much that the hon. Gentleman has not given a better explanation of it, because it is a matter which affects the county for which he sits.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Surely that is a matter for European arrangement.

***MR. EMMOTT**: I wish the right hon. Gentleman would deal with it in that sense. That is the only way in which the wider question can be dealt with, viz., another European Conference, in which I should have much more faith than any other method. But as regards the French Congo, it might have been arranged with France. There are many reasons why that might have been done. In the first place, these companies are not paying because they do not bring in the element of force. In the Congo Free State they bring in that element but the French are a humane people. Again, I believe there is in France, as in this country, a genuine desire for friendship. I think it is a great pity therefore that we did not settle this question with France. On the whole, although the Bill justifies the criticisms of detail, and some of them are serious criticism, I am perfectly certain that the people of this country, as well as Members on both sides of the House, desire to cordially congratulate the Government on having made the Treaty, and they believe it is for the benefit of the nation.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time and committed for To-morrow.

SHOP HOURS BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

***SIR CHARLES DILKE** (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) said he should not object to this Bill being taken now. It was quite unnecessary for him to detain the House by going into the history of the question, because it had been fully discussed this year already. He wished to state that it was his intention to divide the House against the Second Reading upon two grounds. He opposed the measure for the two reasons which he gave in the Resolution he had placed on the Paper, which was that this Bill—

> "Is unduly hampered by restrictions, and, not providing for the regulation of the hours of shop assistants, fails to satisfy the terms of the unanimous Resolution of this House."

These restrictions were matters which might be dealt with in Committee, and therefore he would not press them at this stage. His second objection, however, could not be dealt with in Committee. Last year they passed a Resolution unanimously which showed the feeling of the House, and the Government objected to one portion of that Resolution. The Resolution was to the effect that the matter might be left to the option of the local authorities, and that the legislation on the subject should include also the hours of employment of shop assistants. The Government objected to the words "shop assistants," but they were unable to divide the House, and they allowed the words to be carried against them in a unanimous Resolution. In the opinion of those who had given a good deal of time to this subject, it was unnecessary to hamper this Bill by forcing it to be put in operation by two-thirds of the shopkeepers in the district dealt with. They thought that was an undue infringement of the principle of local option, and that the matter might be left to the great local authorities in the country to deal with the matter as they pleased. He begged to move.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.) seconded the Amendment. It was very often lost sight of by the House that the closing of shops at certain hours would be no guarantee whatever as to the time during which shops assistants might be employed. It was no uncommon thing in certain businesses for shop assistants to be employed an hour before the business of the day opened, and very often they were engaged an hour or two after the business closed. At festival times such as Christmas and other occasions, the hours worked by the assistants were out of all proportion to the pay they received. They were obliged to do that work at the risk of dismissal. Cases were on record of men and women being employed continuously day and night with very short relaxation for sleep on those occasions.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out from the word 'That' to the end of the Question, in order to add the words 'in the opinion of this House, the proposed measure for the early closing of Shops is unduly hampered by restrictions, and, not providing for the regulation of the hours of shop assistants, fails to satisfy the terms of the unanimous Resolution of this House.'"—(*Sir Charles Dilke.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

SIR FREDERICK BANBURY (Camberwell, Peckham) said he did not approve of the Bill. The object of the measure was to ensure that for a certain time certain shops might be closed. A certain number of assistants worked too long hours on certain occasions, but he doubted whether this Bill would remove their hardship. It was a very great mistake for the House of Commons to be continually interfering with the liberty of the subject, and preventing people from keeping open as long as it was desirable in their own interest to keep open. In regard to large shops, he believed the Bill would be useless. The people to whom it would apply in a hard manner were the owners of small shops who worked the shops themselves with the assistance of their families. The people whom they served were of the working class, and they were unable to shop in the day time. It was, therefore, necessary that these shops should be open for their convenience. In a good many cases, though these small shops were open for a good many hours a day, very little business was done during the middle of the day, and the people in charge were able to sit down and rest. Unless there was very strong ground in the interest of the health of the community for such legislation, he thought it was a very great mistake for the Government to interfere with trade and business in the way proposed. He did not think any ground of that kind could be shown in this case. He wished to call attention to the constitution of the authority with respect to London. London was a conglomeration of large towns with divergent interests, and it was quite impossible for the London County Council to be the authority for the whole area for the purposes of this Bill. The local authority ought to have local knowledge, and he did not think it would be argued that the London County Council had that knowledge. It could not be denied that the work of the London County Council at the present moment was very arduous. While he was anxious that the education of London should be in the hands of the County Council, he did not think that for this particular purpose the County Council was a fit body, and he hoped that his hon. friend would, in Committee, substitute the Metropolitan Borough Councils for the London County Council. The reason for that was, that the borough councils were much more likely to know the needs of the locality, and the actual ways and means by which the different trades were carried on, than the London County Council. The borough councils were more in touch with the small shopkeepers and the inhabitants generally, and would be more likely to carry out the Orders under the Bill, and the wishes of the people. He must confess that the principle of the Bill was one which he should never have thought would have been brought forward by a Conservative Government; and if the right hon. Baronet the Member for Forest of Dean went to a division he should vote for him, but not for the same reason that actuated the right hon. Gentleman.

MR. ASQUITH (Fifeshire, E.) said he was not inclined to indulge in anything like hostile criticism of the Bill, but he thought it was a very mild and homœopathic measure of reform. He very much regretted that the Government had not so framed its title and scope as to make it possible to introduce Amendments in Committee to meet the cases of common occurrence where shop assistants were compulsorily employed either before the opening, or after the closing, of the shops. He had given a great deal of attention to this subject for many years, and he was satisfied that no measure would be really effective which did not couple with the power of compulsorily closing the shop itself some sanction by which the shop assistants should not be employed unless for a short interval after the closing hour. He very much regretted that the Government had not put some provision of that kind into the Bill, which would relieve the shop assistants from excessive hours of labour and ensure for them reasonable leisure. At the same time he should be very sorry that anything should be done to arrest the progress of this very modest measure of reform. He hoped, however, when the Bill got into Committee, that the Government would consider the other branch of the Amendment, and see whether it was not possible somewhat to simplify the local procedure. He quite agreed that the initiative should be with the local authority; but he should like to see a freer hand given to the local authority; nor did he see that it was at all necessary that Orders under the Bill should be laid before Parliament for forty days before they came into operation. Sympathising with every step forward in the direction of reform in a class of work which had been too long neglected by the Legislature, he heartily supported the Second Reading.

MR. LAWRENCE (Liverpool, Abercromby) said that for many years he had opposed measures of this kind on principle, because they interfered with the liberty of the individual; but he quite recognised that there were certain districts of great towns where the action of the local authorities could bring about a natural and sensible means of increasing the leisure of those who had to stand behind the counter all day long. Therefore he was prepared to give this measure a welcome, as it dealt with a difficult question in a careful and moderate manner. In the constituency he represented there were two most important shops which evidently met a great local want in keeping open to a late hour, and, judging by the popularity with which these shops were patronised, there was little want for this Bill. At the same time, in the city of Liverpool there was a great desire to benefit the toiling masses in the shop districts, and he thought that some measure like this should receive the sanction of the House. He quite approved that the local authorities should have the initiative in this movement, and he agreed with the right hon. Gentleman opposite that there should be an appeal to this House for confirmation of the Orders.

*MR. THORNTON (Clapham) said he would not oppose the Second Reading of the Bill, but, with some considerable knowledge of South London, he should not be very sorry if some Amendments were introduced in Committee which would allow an exemption of shopkeepers who were assisted only by members of their own families. He felt that there was a danger in the number of "ifs" in this Bill, and that shopkeepers might, on account of uncertainty, withdraw the weekly half-holiday on Wednesdays, which had been such a great boon to shop assistants, and which had been gained by voluntary agency and with the concurrence of all well-wishers to those who had often much too long hours behind the counter, towards the shortening of which time this Bill would indirectly tend. The principle of the Bill he could not oppose, and therefore he would give his vote for the Second Reading; but he would put down Amendments for the Committee stage on the point he had indicated.

And, it being half-past Seven of the clock, the debate stood adjourned to this Evening's Sitting.

EVENING SITTING.

SHOP HOURS BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment to Question [1st June], "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Which Amendment was—

"To leave out from the word 'That' to the end of the Question, in order to add the words 'in the opinion of this House, the proposed measure for the early closing of Shops is unduly hampered by restrictions, and not providing for the regulation of the hours of shop assistants, fails to satisfy the terms of the unanimous Resolution of this House.' "—(*Sir Charles Dilke.*)

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

MR. WHITLEY (Halifax) said that for two reasons he would be unable to support the Amendment, first, because he did not think it desirable in a Bill of this kind to give local authorities power to fix the hours of labour in particular trades; and secondly, because he was convinced that once such a Bill was passed, although it might well be simplified in Committee with a view to making it easier of application, it would be within the power of the shop assistants themselves to secure an adequate reduction of the excessive hours at present too frequently worked. He was thankful that the Government had had the courage to bring forward even so moderate a Bill as the present; he hoped the measure would be pressed forward, and that the Government would not allow it to be immured in another place as so many attempts in the same direction had been in the past. He believed in the principle of enabling an adequate majority of local traders to bring about a reduction in the number of hours during which shops might be open, the experience of his own constituency showing the great benefit which accrued from a voluntary arrangement carried out on those lines. But though voluntary arrangement might work very well, there was always the fear that one powerful trader might break away from the agreement, or that a company might establish a new branch in a district, and break down the whole scheme. Consequently, such a Bill as that under consideration was necessary, and he was confident that no hardship would accrue from its operation. Traders in a district would have to be practically unanimous before the measure could be brought into force, and if all the shopkeepers in a particular line were on the same level none would suffer. The small shopkeeper would not be put at a disadvantage, because when people knew that the shops would be closed at a certain hour they would arrange to do their shopping within the limits prescribed. With regard to the cases in which individual traders voluntarily gave their assistants in turn a half-day in the week, he thought it was not too much to ask that those traders should give way to the general convenience and close their shops on a particular day, so that the small traders might secure the same benefit as the larger traders in many cases now voluntarily gave to their assistants. While reserving to himself the right to move Amendments on one or two points of detail, he should support the Second Reading of the Bill.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTSON (Hackney, S.) sympathised with the Amendment to a certain extent. It was true the Bill did not deal with the hours during which shop assistants could be employed. The real evil with which it was necessary to deal was not so much the keeping open of the shops, as the excessive hours that many assistants were called upon to labour. In the case of the small shops, in which no one was employed in the ordinary sense, and the proprietors simply sat in a little back parlour while waiting for customers, it mattered very little how late they kept open. It was not desired to close such shops as those, but the establishments in which assistants were kept on their feet and at work during excessive hours. That was doubtless one of the most difficult problems with which they had to deal. Lord Avebury's Bills invariably provided for the exception of the small shopkeeper, but it was difficult to see how such a provision could be introduced into the scheme of the present measure. In South Hackney there were a very large number of small shops, employing practically no assistants at all, while the remaining portion of the borough contained shops of considerable magnitude. These latter would probably have the predominant vote, and thus be able to close the smaller shops, although that would not be their intention in voting. He did not believe there was any hostility felt by the large shops to the small shops, because, as each had an entirely different class of customers, the large shops were not affected by the small shops remaining open. But it would be found in most districts that, while the great majority of the large shops would be willing to close, a small number of large shops would insist upon remaining open; and while the majority of the large shops were not anxious to close the small shops, they did desire that the outstanding large ships should be forced to close at the hour agreed upon. Therefore it was most important to secure that when shops of the same calibre, so to speak, agreed by a large majority to close, the minority of the same calibre should not be allowed to remain open; at the same time, that small shops which were not really within the evil that it was desired to remedy, as they did not employ outside assistance, should not be forced to close. He hoped the Government would not agree to omit Sub-section 6 as suggested by the hon. Member for Halifax. If a proprietor found Thursday, say, to be the most convenient day for him to close his shop, it would be most unreasonable to force him to keep open on Thursday and close on Saturday; that was surely a matter which the proprietor, guided by the wishes of his assistants and customers, should be allowed to decide.

It was difficult to see what the central authority were going to do in the matter, because except in the case of a very outrageous Order they could not very well make any revision, as they would not have the necessary local knowledge. As to the revocation of the Order, he thought the local authority ought to have much wider powers. There were many reasons other than that stated in the Bill which might make a revocation desirable. He did not agree with the hon. Member for Halifax that if all shops were placed on an equality none would suffer hardship. At present the small shopkeepers secured a certain amount of custom after the large shops were closed. The large shopkeepers did not object to that, and if the small man was compelled to close he would be deprived of an advantage which was a benefit both to himself and to the purchasing public. He hoped, therefore, the Government would consent to Amendments with a view to preventing such a result as that. It was pointed out that it was objectionable to have the County Council the authority for London, and that the borough councils should be the authority. No one could accuse him of hostility to the County Council; but, at the same time, he did not think it was the right authority to put the Act in force. It was quite impossible that the County Council could have more than two members who were acquainted with the needs and requirements of any particular district in London, and even they might not reside in the district they represented. Moreover, the County Council did not pretend to have any special knowledge of the subject. No doubt they could undertake work which more or less extended over a number of districts, but this matter of shopping was a very delicate matter indeed; the wages paid in the different districts were different; the custom in each locality was different; and although he considered that the borough councils would be an undesirably large authority, there was not the slightest doubt that it would be very much better than the County Council. He therefore hoped that the Government would in Committee accept an Amendment making the borough councils the authority.

*MR. WILLIAM ABRAHAM (Glamorganshire, Rhondda) said he wished to explain the vote he intended to give on this occasion. He did not remember an instance in which he voted in which his right hon. friend the Member for the Forest of Dean was not with him, But on this occasion he did not see his way to support his right hon. friend by voting for the rejection of the Bill. In his opinion the Bill was a step in the right direction. The first principle of the Bill was to close the shops; and he was in favour of every movement in the House that tended directly or indirectly to ameliorate the condition of the working classes. He was quite alive to the fact that the Bill did not provide for the compulsory shortening of the hours of work, but, knowing the strides the shop assistants were making with their organisation, in his opinion, if this modest measure were passed, the shop assistants would, by their union, be able to make a considerable improvement in the present condition with regard to the hours of labour. He was not surprised that hon. Gentlemen opposite found a kind of indirect reason for opposing the Bill. The hon. Gentleman the Member for Peckham was well known as a blocker of all Bills that had any tendency in favour of the working classes; and he had found salvation in this matter in the Amendment proposed by his right hon. friend the Member for the Forest of Dean.

He himself, however, was in the position of the gentleman who was wooing two sisters. One he liked very much, but she did not care for him. He was about to be married to the other sister, when the clergyman asked him if he would take this woman to be his wedded wife, and he said he would but that he would rather have her sister. He was prepared to take this small measure as a step in the right direction; and he would support the Second Reading hoping and believing that during the Committee stage they would be able to get some substantial improvements, though not perhaps in the direction which his right hon. friend and the Labour Members had at heart. That was his position in the matter. He would rather accept what he could get than be guilty of rejecting the Bill altogether. Sub-clause 6 of Clause 2 was, in his opinion, one of the things which would make this Bill inoperative. They had only to allow the big shopkeeper to have his own way and he would create such a bone of contention in his locality as would make the Bill inoperative in the end. They were asked why they wanted to legislate at all, and were told that the localities should be left to make their own local arrangements. He represented a great industrial district; and he was almost ashamed to admit that the shop assistants found themselves, not behind the counter, but in the shops after midnight on Saturday night. He asked the House to put a stop to that state of things. He knew a small district in his constituency where the shopkeepers were asked to close at a certain hour, but one gentleman could not see his way clear to co-operate—he had such sympathy with the people who could not come in time. His own opinion, however, was that that sympathy was not with the people but with himself. The moment it was known that the shops would be closed at a certain hour the people would find time to come. It was said that they should show sympathy with the small shopkeeper; but that again was a false argument. What they wanted was to let everybody know that the shops were to be closed at a certain hour, and then people would come in time to make their purchases. Even if the present hours were extended people would come at the last moment. He hoped his right hon. friend would withdraw his Amendment; because, although the measure was not a thousandth part of what it should be, yet, in his humble opinion, it was a step in the right direction, and he would therefore vote for it.

*SIR FRANCIS POWELL (Wigan) said that in his humble opinion the Bill met the requirements of the community and of individuals; and as representing a large manufacturing and commercial constituency he thanked the Government for its introduction, There was one feature of the Bill which at once commended itself to his mind, and that was the practical introduction of a half-holiday once a week. He had supported Sir John Lubbock in his Bill, and he ventured to say that if those proposals ever were to become operative it would be necessary to incorporate a similar provision in this Bill. In Wigan, which he had the honour to represent, they had a weekly half-holiday every Wednesday, which regulated all transactions in the town except chemists' shops. There was no word of complaint on the part of the customers, except perhaps from some lady who forgot that she could not buy a yard of ribbon on that particular day. It was regarded by all concerned as a precious privilege which greaty added to the happiness and prosperity of their lives. This Bill was not too rigid and iron in its provisions, because the different conditions of different localities and the different circumstances of particular cases might be met by the machinery which the Bill provided. There was one great difficulty which they met with time after time in the Committees on which he had the honour of serving and which inquired into this subject. That was where different trades were carried on in the same shop. It was denounced by their friend of many years standing, who was now gone, the late Sir John Blundell Maple, who was the occupant of large premises where various trades were conducted; and his objection on that ground was fatal to legislation in former years. He hoped the provision suggested in this Bill would be of such a character and would afford such elasticity that that difficulty might be overcome and a serious obstacle to legislation in former years be thereby removed.

Not a word was said to-day about the House of Lords Committee which reported in 1901. So rapidly was this question moving that that Report was now almost an obsolete document. A proposal was made in that Report that the regulation of shops should be made by Provisional Order. That always seemed to him to be a fatal blot in that Report. A Provisional Order was a dilatory and cumbersome process; and though not expensive when applied to large schemes, would be very expensive when applied to such a small matter as the regulation of shops. The provision in the Bill met the case precisely. First of all, the local authority would be instructed to make inquiry; and they would have no difficulty in gauging public opinion; any proposal must have the support of two-thirds of the shops of the trades concerned; then an Order might be made with power of final revision by the central authority. He believed that revision would be of great service. The provision that the central authority would have some power in this matter was a very valuable one. It would work to the advantage of the community, and he believed would work extremely well in practice. With reference to what had been said by his hon. friend in regard to what were known as domestic shops, where the shop was kept by the wife or daughter, and was essentially a domestic concern, he thought there ought to be some provision by which such a simple trade carried on for the convenience of the neighbours might be safeguarded. He congratulated those who had advocated this measure for many years on the progress they had made. The fact was, the question had advanced because the habits of the nation had changed. There had been a marked alteration in the last few years in the lives of the entire shop-keeping community. The shopkeeper now lived less and less in the premises where he conducted his business. He left his shop in the evening and reached his villa residence easily by tram or other easy method of locomotion, and he was as anxious for early closing now as were his assistants. There was co-operation in the matter between employers and employed; and he felt quite convinced that the solution of the problem was near at hand. The Bill was introduced under happy circumstances. It was not the result of a trade dispute; it was the result of the gradual change of opinion on both sides of the House; and he was sure that it would prove most salutary and advantageous in its operation. Several shopkeepers had told him that legislation of this kind was really necessary as there was increasing difficulty in inducing promising young men and young women to enter shops. They objected to the restraint, and to the long hours; but if the occupation were made more attractive that difficulty would be removed and they would find that the shop assistants would derive great advantage from the many opportunities of culture which now existed and of which at present they were deprived. Those who lived long enough to see the effect of this legislation would be grateful to the House of Commons for passing into law a Bill which would have the most salutary effect on the lives and fortunes of a most deserving class.

DR. FARQUHARSON (Aberdeenshire, W.) said he had the honour of sitting on two Committees which considered this question, and after a careful survey of the evidence he had come to the conclusion that a Bill of this kind was urgently needed. He would appeal to the right hon. Gentleman to withdraw his Amendment, and to use his great knowledge, when the Bill was in Committee, to make it a practical working measure to carry out the noble aspirations so eloquently expressed by his hon. friend who had just spoken. He would support the Bill from three points of view. Firstly, he was convinced that the voluntary system was hopeless and impracticable, and had broken down, for the reason that in a particular district a few shops stood out and derived benefit from the closing of the other shops. He had no particular knowledge of the working of the London County Council, except knowledge derived from observation of its methods. They were told that it was entirely new to this legislation, and was not prepared to carry it out practically. He regretted very much to have heard that from a London Member. If his hon. friend went up to Scotland he would see that the county councils there were very different bodies. They were composed of practical men to whom he would willingly trust the carrying out of local arrangements under this Bill. The second reason why he supported the Bill was that the evidence showed that it would not inflict any hardship on the working classes. They had emphatic evidence before them that the working classes were quite able to adapt their time to the circumstances of the case, whatever the hour of shutting up might be. The third reason why he supported the Bill was because it was a great and urgent necessity in the interests of the health of the shop employees. He was appointed by the chairman of one of the Committees to collect medical evidence, and he brought together a very strong body of medical opinion which was unanimous in stating that the health of every class of the community connected with shops did suffer from the long hours they were compelled to work. He thought that was a point which could not be too emphatically dwelt upon. He believed that in the Bill they had the framework of a good and useful measure; and he again appealed to the right hon. Baronet not to press his Amendment. Let the Second Reading be passed by consent; and let the right hon. Baronet and other Members who worked so loyally on this question put down Amendments in Committee. If the right hon. Baronet pressed his Amendment to a division, he would feel it his duty to vote against it.

*THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. COCHRANE, Ayrshire, N.) thought he had reason to be satisfied with the general reception of the Bill, the credit of which, however, if he obtained the Second Reading and had the measure sent to a Committee, would be due to Lord Avebury, the pioneer of legislative work on this subject. The subject had been considered by several Select Committees, and it had been the subject of more than one Resolution in the House of Commons. The matter had been well ventilated, and the evils the Bill was designed to cure were generally recognised by the House—the evils of long and unnecessary hours among shop assistants. Shop assistants were frequently kept at work late at night for no useful purpose whatever; the business could be done just as well earlier in the evening; but a fashion seemed to have grown up under which shopping was done later and later, regardless of the fact that the health of shop assistants was being seriously injured by the long hours they were obliged to work. The measure did not unnecessarily curtail the freedom of the subject, but it would prevent whole districts of shopkeepers being obliged to keep open because of the unwillingness of a minority, sometimes consisting of one man, to enter into a voluntary agreement. He had obtained specific instances from a deputation of one man's preventing the adoption of a weekly half-holiday in several districts of London. Freedom was a good thing, but where it became liberty to compel so many other people to work unnecessary hours it was the grossest tyranny. The right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean agreed that some measure was necessary, but wished to proceed in a different way by restricting the hours of labour. The Government did not think that was the proper solution, and there was no precedent in the legislation of this House, and only one, he believed, throughout the British Empire, for interfering with the hours of labour of adult shop assistants. That one exception was afforded by Victoria, but the other colonial precedents applied only to shop assistants under a certain age.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: There are four cases in your own Orders under the Home Office—in regard to dangerous trades.

*MR. COCHRANE said that they were on account of danger, which was a perfectly distinct element. This Bill closely followed the beneficent legislation of the Factory Acts. Incidentally it did shorten the hours of labour, but it did so indirectly. It would shorten the hours at the time of day when it was most desirable for the health of the assistants that the hours of labour should be curtailed. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Fife desired that the shop assistants should not be employed in a shop for more than a certain time after the shop was closed.

That was a rather impracticable proposal. It would require a perfect army of spies to ascertain whether after a shop was closed the assistants were being kept at work inside. The proposal was also unnecessary, for after a shop was closed it would not be in the interest of the employer to keep his staff a longer time than was required for packing up the cases and doing such other work as was usual and necessary after the closing of the shop. His hon. friend the Member for Peckham gave an instance of a shopkeeper who had expressed himself as hostile to the Bill, and said he had others; but in the correspondence he had himself received there was but one man who expressed a similar view, while there were hundreds who expressed themselves in favour of the Bill, and even the one who was opposed to the Bill, although he wrote as a small shopkeeper, concluded his letter by saying, "Thank God, I am no longer a shopkeeper!"

Many of the points raised in the debate were such as might well be considered in Committee. Among these was the question of the authority for the administration of the Act. Certainly much could be said in favour of the metropolitan borough councils, who might be supposed to know the wants and feelings of shopkeepers and consumers in their boroughs. An Amendment on this point would no doubt receive careful and friendly consideration in Committee. The reason the authority named in the Bill was inserted was that it was the same authority as had power under the Shop Acts of 1892 and 1895 to appoint inspectors. The whole question had been most fully argued in Reports of Committees, and most important among these was the House of Lords Committee of 1901, upon which the late Lord Salisbury sat, and whose views were materially modified by the evidence he heard. It was found from that evidence that the hours of work ranged as high as eighty to ninety a week, besides the time occupied after closing in putting away goods, and medical evidence was strong that such long hours in crowded ill-ventilated buildings, lighted by gas, must be injurious and often ruinous to the health of shop assistants, especially in the case of women. For this reason the Government had introduced the Bill. It could not be doubted that long hours under such conditions must lead to that physical deterioration of which so much had been heard. Very strong was the testimony of high medical authorities in favour of such legislation. To show how strong that testimony was he would read two paragraphs from the Report of the Committee of 1901—

"We are able, however, to appeal to the highest medical testimony as to the injury thus caused. In 1888 the Presidents of the two great medical colleges, with some of the other leaders of the medical profession, Sir James Paget, Sir Andrew Clarke, Dr. Mathews Duncan, Mr. John Marshall, Dr. Playfair, Dr. Priestley, Sir Richard Quain, Sir William Savory, Sir Samuel Wilks, called the attention of Parliament to the subject and urged the passing of the Early Closing Bill.

"Considering the weight which belongs to that memorial, and the fact that its statements have never been seriously challenged, the Committee did not deem it necessary to multiply medical evidence on the subject. The Presidents, however, both of the College of Physicians and of the College of Surgeons, have come before us and spoken strongly on the great and increasing evils of the present long hours. Sir W. MacCormac stated 'That there is no doubt in my mind that such long hours must contribute to the incidence of disease; that it must lower the general vitality of persons so engaged, and render them more liable than they otherwise would be to attacks of different forms of disease, and most especially on account of the long hours at night which such a period of work during the week entails. These hours, too, for the most part are worked in an atmosphere very prejudicial to health, and we know how largely the air so contaminated contributes to the production of various forms of disease in which tubercule, for instance, and the manifold forms of disease in which tubercule manifests itself, and that other disease of great cities (ricketts) has some parts of its origin from this cause. I think, as we have called attention to it, women, more especially growing women, women who have not reached the full growth of their sex, are most prone to suffer from such long hours.'"

"Furthermore, he urged on us that the evil is one which increases as time runs on; 'it is gradual and progressive in its effects, and it goes on, I am afraid, in a cumulative degree.'"

Shopkeepers through their associations were strongly in favour of the Bill, and it had not been shown that the shortening of the hours of business would be any hardship to purchasers. More than 300 tradesmen's associations petitioned the Committee of 1901 in favour of the principle of this Bill, and similar petitions are being received every day, but practically none of a hostile character have come to hand. The case of the small shopkeepers was carefully inquired into by the Committee to which he had referred, and they reported—

> "The evils of late closing press with especial severity on the owners of small shops, and although it is undoubtedly more difficult to ascertain the views of the very small shopkeepers than of those who are more fully organised, we were assured by the large majority of witnesses conversant with the facts that the small tradesmen were as anxious as, or even more anxious than, the richer shopkeepers for some legislation which would enable them to shorten hours."

That was certainly not a very radical body, and he hoped their finding would have some weight with his hon. friend the Member for Peckham. As to the small purchasers, the evidence of the representatives of the co-operative stores showed that the alleged hardship was rather chimerical, and when they became aware that they were imposing a burden upon other people by shopping so late, they would be perfectly willing to put themselves to a little inconvenience in order to make their purchases earlier. The Bill was purposely drafted so as to give considerable elasticity, and to allow local authorities to give the fullest effect to the particular requirements of their localities. The local authority might fix, within certain defined limits, the hours at which shops, either in the whole or in part of its area, or any particular class of shops, should be closed. Further, the local authority, having full knowledge of the local requirements, might prohibit the carrying on of retail trade other than in shops after the closing hour or permit it subject to conditions. The hour which might be fixed by any local authority could not in any case be earlier than seven in the evening, except on one day in the week, when it could not be earlier than 1 o'clock, and there was nothing in the provisions to prevent the local authority fixing a much later hour on any day of the week to meet the requirements of any particular class of the community. It was further provided, to meet the wishes of those to whom a half-holiday on one particular day might be inconvenient, that they might on giving proper notice substitute some other day. That was to say, if a class of shopkeepers fixed upon Saturday, for instance, to close, any shopkeeper of that class might arrange to give the half-holiday on Thursday, for instance, if that day were more convenient for his customers. The Bill also provided for the fullest publicity. Every opportunity was given for hearing objections. There was an appeal to the Home Secretary, who had power to order a local inquiry and upon its report to disallow, affirm, or amend the Order of the local authority, and if he allowed it the Order must lie for forty days on the Table of the House before it came into operation. The Bill had been drafted with the earnest desire to interfere as little as possible with the shopkeepers or the purchasers; it was an honest endeavour to meet a serious and growing evil which directly affected the national welfare and the national health; and he believed it would put a stop to grievously long hours and would be accepted as a boon by shop assistants. He thanked the House for the kindly reception they had given to the Bill, and he hoped they would agree to the Second Reading and to its reference to the Committee on Trade.

SIR WALTER FOSTER (Derbyshire, Ilkeston) said the hon. Gentleman who had just spoken had placed before the House incontrovertible arguments in favour of legislation in the direction of this Bill; he had quoted words which seemed almost to justify the inclusion of shopkeeping in the designation of dangerous trades; and yet the Government had brought in a Bill which would become practically a dead letter if passed into law. If the Government intended dealing with the question at all they ought to have had the courage to grapple seriously with the situation, and to introduce a measure really worth carrying. The present Bill provided so many impediments against its working that it was probable nothing would be or could be done under it. It was utterly inadequate to meet so serious an evil, and he should support the Amendment of his right hon. friend the Member for the Forest of Dean, not as a protest against the Bill because it was a step in the wrong direction, but because it was inadequate to meet the great social evil against which it was directed. The Amendment simply sought to carry out the unanimous Resolution of the House of Commons, passed in 1903, in which it was declared to be desirable—

"that borough and district councils should be authorised to make such regulations in respect of the closing of shops and the limitation of the hours of labour of shop assistants as may seem to them to be necessary in the areas under their jurisdiction.'

*MR. COCHRANE: Will the hon. Member read the last paragraph?

SIR WALTER FOSTER (reading)—

"thus effectively carrying out the recommendations of the Select Committee of the House of Lords on the early closing of shops as embodied in Paragraph 15 of the Report of 1901."

*MR. COCHRANE pointed out that in those recommendations there was no reference to the limitation of the hours of labour.

SIR WALTER FOSTER said the Resolution was the deliberately expressed opinion of the House of Commons, and as that contained such a reference he held they were entitled to demand that when legislation was introduced it should have the decency to observe suggestions made by the House itself. It was not so much the managers of large shops or even the owners of small shops that required to be considered as the unfortunate shop assistants who were compelled to work after the shops were closed. Moreover, the Bill did not give local authorities a free hand. If local authorities were put in power they ought to be treated generously and allowed to look after their own affairs. A borough council was quite as competent to deal with this matter as the central authority could be. He would give them power to look after their own affairs in their own locality and allow them to deal with the particular trades in their own areas. This Bill hampered them and put fresh difficulties in their way. He would like a little more vigour put into this measure. When they gave local authorities the initiative they ought to trust them to carry it out. Seeing that local authorities had been placed in power so largely throughout the country, they ought to treat them generously and let them look after their own affairs, retaining a certain amount of central control to secure some uniformity of action. But this Bill would not bring about such a state of things. Those hon. Members who supported the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean would do so as a protest, because this Bill was not strong enough for their taste. He felt that in Committee they might be able to strengthen the measure. He thought the schedule of the Bill required alteration, and the exemption of certain trades which did not conduce to the morality or health of the public could not be justified. He did not see why those who sold intoxicating liquors were to be placed outside the scope of this measure. He would not enter into details at that stage, but he protested against the measure because it was not strong enough to meet the evils which had been so graphically described by the hon. Member on the Front Bench opposite.

MR. ERNEST GRAY (West Ham, N.) said he was anxious to ascertain the attitude of the Government in regard to the Sunday morning opening of shops. If power was given to local authorities to close shops at an early hour on Saturday night, power should also be given to them to prevent their object being defeated by a hostile minority opening on Sunday morning and thus compelling others to do the same. He also thought that it was unsatisfactory that the local authority should be able to close all the shops in a given area, although the whole of one trade might object. It was quite impossible to treat shopkeepers with perishable goods on the same footing as those who could keep their goods till the next day without sustaining any loss. Those familiar with the East End of London knew the evils caused there by Sunday morning trading, and they did not want those evils increased by the operation of this Bill.

Mr. THEODORE TAYLOR (Lancashire, Radcliffe) said the Amendment had two parts, one of which related to the hours of labour of assistants. Of course that was outside the scope of the Bill, and, although they might regret that it was not in the Bill, that was not any reason why they should vote for the Amendment, because they might approve or disapprove of the restrictions which many of them desired to see imposed on the hours of shop assistants and agree to differ on that point because it was not before them. But they must take notice of the fact that the Under-Secretary for the Home Department had told them that the Government distinctly joined issue on the labour question. The only reason the hon. Member gave against it, however, was on the ground of its practicability. He gave them many reasons why the hours of labour of assistants in shops ought to be restricted, and the only reason he gave against it was on the ground of the difficulty of inspection. He admitted it would be difficult to inspect shops after they were closed at night. But the inspectors need not go and inspect every shop. If they took notice of the complaints made by the unions of shop assistants he had no doubt that with a very little amount of inspection they would find out a great deal of abuse. He thought the Under-Secretary was entirely wrong when he stated that it would not be to the interests of the shopkeepers to keep the assistants working after the shops were closed. He was afraid there were a great many shopkeepers who did think it was to their interest to work their people too long hours. If there were no such people there would be no need for restrictive legislation in the matter of hours. It was not only the small shops which worked their assistants long hours, for in some of the large shops to-day the assistants were worked after the shops were closed. In those instances the shopkeepers would continue to think that was to their interest, and if there were no inspectors to prevent it that abuse might go on to an even greater extent than it did now. Such people would think that because they were forced to close earlier they would make their assistants do work which perhaps a porter did now, and they would thus try to economise by making their assistants work the same number of hours they did now. After the testimony they had heard in the course of the debate as to the extraordinary number of hours that some assistants had to work it was surely reasonable to ask that they should be diminished from eighty or ninety a week to sixty or seventy. Such a reduction was more called for than the legislation of two years ago by which they reduced the hours of factory workers from fifty-six and a half to fifty-five and a half. The working classes were emphatic in favour of the Amendment and the smaller shopkeepers were also in favour of it. But under the Bill every shopkeeper would have a vote and the small shopkeeper's vote would count for one just the same as the big shopkeeper's in making up the two-thirds necessary to bring the measure into operation. Therefore he thought their interests were quite safe under the Bill.

SIR FREDERICK BANBURY said that after the speech of the hon. Member opposite he had come to the conclusion that the Amendment was so bad that he should vote against it.

MR. CORBETT (Glasgow, Tradeston) said that those shopkeepers who had banded themselves together for more than half a century in order to secure the earlier closing of shops intended that the assistants should leave at an earlier hour. This Act would be of some benefit to the assistants even in those shops where the employees had to work a short time after the shops were closed because those shops would have to close earlier. He wished to point out that the conditions of trade were very widely different in different shops at different seasons. It had been argued that under the Bill there was a danger of some particular trade being compelled to close earlier against its will on account of the decision of two-thirds of the whole of the traders in a particular neighbourhood. In his opinion, however, the local authority would be quite ready and willing to protect any particular trade against such an injustice. He thought the difficulties in regard to the working of this Bill had been very much overstated. In Glasgow, at any rate, he thought there would be no difficulty whatever in getting the municipality to take the necessary steps to give effect to the desires of the shopkeepers. With regard to Sunday trading many hon. Members would heartily welcome a stringent measure to prevent this growing abuse of the Sunday opening of shops, and he thought something to this end might be introduced into this measure. The hon. Member opposite had been rather severe in his criticism of the proposal which enabled individual shopkeepers to have a different early closing day to the other tradesmen. The exception contemplated by this measure was in favour of Saturday, because in many neighbourhoods where Wednesday was preferred by the great bulk of the shopkeepers it was felt that if there were certain higher class shops who desired Saturday closing they should have the power to select that day, which was the most desirable day for the assistants because it afforded them better opportunities for week-end recreation. He hoped that nothing would be done to prevent or delay the passing of this Bill. It was a measure that would confer great benefit upon shop assistants.

MR. J. A. PEASE (Essex, Saffron Walden) said he hoped that the Government would not be too ready to accept the suggestion that the London borough councils should be the local authority instead of the London County Council. If there was to be uniformity of administration, the local authority must be the London County Council. Otherwise they might by handing the control over to the boroughs have one side of a street closed early on the Wednesday and the other side of the same street closed early upon another day. He thought it would be quite easy for the London County Council to ascertain the views of the borough councils, and therefore he thought that the London County Council would be the right authority for London under this Bill. Upon the principle that half a loaf was better than no bread he proposed to support the Government although he felt that this Bill was wholly inadequate to deal with the great evil which existed. This measure, he thought, indicated the incapacity of the Government to legislate in conformity with public opinion when they introduced a Bill of this kind to deal with such a crying evil.

Dr. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.) said he concurred with what had fallen from the last speaker in regard to the London County Council. The matter should be left to the County Council and that body in this, as in other matters, would no doubt act in consultation with the borough councils. With regard to the Bill generally he had during the greater part of the debate found himself in a position of great difficulty. When he looked at the Bill it struck him as a very timid little measure, but still a small step forward. When he looked at the Amendment, he found it was correct. The Bill did nothing to lessen the hours of assistants which was the real point at issue. But even a halting step like this would have his support. The Under-Secretary's speech was a most eloquent one in favour of the Amendment. The hon. Gentleman seemed to glory in the restrictions, and he dilated at great length upon them. This was something in the nature of a wooden nutmeg scheme. The hon. Gentleman read quotations and gave an eloquent description of the present position, and then he said it was not expedient for the Government at any rate to do anything directly in the way of shortening the hours of shop assistants. He did not think that was the position which the majority of this House would take at all. He hoped that something would be done to see that assistants would not be allowed to work a number of hours after the shop was shut. As a protest against the endeavour to tinker with a serious social problem he should be compelled to vote for the Amendment proposed by his right hon. friend the Member for Forest of Dean.

Mr. SHACKLETON (Lancashire, Clitheroe) said that, if the hours of shop assistants did not come within the Bill, the shop assistants were certainly not in favour of it. It had been said that the difficulty of inspection would prevent that matter being taken up. He thought the question of inspection could be settled in the same way as factory inspection was settled. It was not the number of "catches" an inspector made that was valuable, it was the knowledge that information might be given by organisations as to what was going on in certain places. There was another difficulty in connection with leaving the matter to the local authority, and that was that different hours might be enforced in contiguous places. It appeared to him that some arrangement should be made whereby a uniform number of hours for shops should be adopted for towns of a certain population. So far as London was concerned, it would be absurd to cut it up into districts. He had read a letter from Glasgow in which a shop assistant informed him that for five days a week he worked thirteen hours, and on another day he worked sixteen making a total of eighty-one. He believed that where the co-operative system prevailed the hours of assistants were better.

Question put.

The House divided—Ayes, 130; Noes, 42. (Division List, No. 130.).

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt.Hn.Hugh O
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W. (Leeds
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bignold, Arthur
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Bull, William James
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Cawley, Frederick
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J.A.Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Denny, Colonel
Dickson, Charles Scott
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt.Hn.Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fergusson, Rt.Hn.SirJ.(Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Forster, Henry William
Foster, P. S. (Warwick, S.W.)
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Gordon, Hn.J.E.(Elgin&Nairn)
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Grant, Corrie
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hamilton, Marq of(L'nd'nderry
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Heath, Arthur Howard(Hanley
Heath, James (Staffords, N.W.
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hope, J.F.(Sheffield, Brightside
Hunt, Rowland
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Keswick, Wiliam
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, J. Grant(Yorks., N.R.)
Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham)
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Majendie, James A. H.
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Rt. Hon A G. (Bute
Parkes, Ebenezer
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Percy, Earl
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Ridley, Hon. M.W.(Stalybridge
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, H.C.(North'mb.Tyneside
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Edward Jas.(Somerset
Stroyan, John
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thomas, D. Alfred (Merthyr)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt.Hn.Sir WilliamH.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt.-Col.A.C.E(Taunton
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W.H.(Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt.Hn. E.R.(Bath
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Brigg, John
Burns, John
Caldwell, James
Cremer, William Randal
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Harwood, George
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Kearley, Hudson E.
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lough, Thomas
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
Markham, Arthur Basil
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Malley, William
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Robson, William Snowdon
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Charles Dilke and Captain Norton.

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be committed to the Standing Committee on Trade, etc."—(*Mr. Cochrane*).

SIR WALTER FOSTER said the Aliens Bill was to be sent to the Standing Committee on Trade, and it was undesirable that this Bill should go to the same Committee, as it might be in the way of the other.

MR. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs) moved that this Bill be sent to the Standing Committee on Law.

MR. EUGENE WASON (Clackmannan and Kinross) seconded the Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the words 'Trade, etc.,' and insert the words 'Law, etc.'—(*Mr. Dalziel*)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words 'Trade, etc.' stand part of the Question.'"

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. AKERS DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's) supported the proposal to send the Bill to the Committee on Trade, remarking that it was essentially one that should be considered by that Committee.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 129; Noes, 37. (Division List No. 131.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt.Hn.Hugh O.
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt.Hn GeraldW(Leeds
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bignold, Arthur
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Bull, William James
Burns, John
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V.C.W.(Derbyshire
Chamberlain, RtHnJ.A.(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Denny, Colonel
Dickson, Charles Scott
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Fergusson, Rt.Hn.SirJ. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S.(Warwick, S.W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Gordon, Hn.J.E.(Elgin&Nairn)
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hamilton, Marq.of(L'nd'nderry
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heath, James (Staffords, N. W.
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hope, J.F.(Sheffield, Brightside
Hunt, Rowland
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hn. Arthur Fred
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.
Keswick, William
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, J. Grant (Yorks. N.R.)
Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham)
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Majendie, James A. H.
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Morgan, DavidJ.(Walthamst'w
Morpeth, Viscount
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, RtHnAGraham (Bute)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Paulton, James Mellor
Percy, Earl
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel W.
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Herbert L.(Cleveland)
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Shackleton, David James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, H.C(North'mb. T'neside
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Edw. Jas. (Somerset)
Stroyan, John
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, David A. (Merthyr)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. William Hall

Walrond, Rt.Hn.Sir William H.
Webb, Col. William George
Welby, Lt.-Col.A.C.E(Taunton
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Wilson, A.Stanley (York E.R.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, SirW.H.(Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt.Hn.E.R(Bath)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C.B.Stuart
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES.—Sir Alexander Acland - Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Brigg, John
Caldwell, James
Cawley, Frederick
Cremer, William Randal
Cullinan, J.
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert J.
Grant, Corrie
Harwood, George
Horniman, Frederick John
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Kearley, Hudson E.
Levy, Maurice
Lough, Thomas
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
Markham, Arthur Basil
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Malley, William
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Robson, William Snowdon
Schwann, Charles E.
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sullivan, Donal
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Woodhouse, SirJT(Huddersf'd)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES.—Mr. Dalziel and Mr. Eugene Wason.

Main Question put, and agreed to. Bill committed to the Standing Committee on Trade, etc.

INDIAN COUNCILS BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

MR. SCHWANN (Manchester, N.) said he should like to know whether there was any intention of appointing another member to the Council of the Governor-General of India, and whether he was to be an Englishman or an Indian.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford) said that at present, under the Indian Councils Act of 1874, there was authority for six members of the Council of the Governor-General of India. Up to 1885 there were six members, but then an attempt was made, on the grounds of economy, to reduce the number to five, and the work was apportioned to these five members. Hon. Members who took an interest in India must acknowledge that within the last ten or fifteen years the increase in the work in all the departments of Indian Government had been excessive. Some members had forgone their holidays on that account for ten years, and it was imperative that relief should be given. That it was impossible to do without appointing another member of Council. It was intended by this Bill to repeal so much of the provisions of the Act of 1874 as rendered it necessary that the sixth member of the Council should be member for public works purposes. It was proposed that there should now be a member for commerce and industry.

MR. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid.) said he thought that the Secretary of State for India did not appreciate what the import of the Bill was. Anyone who knew India understood perfectly well that there should be a representative on the Governor's Council of the Department of Public Works. Parliament recognised that in the Indian Councils Act of 1874, but under this Bill the Public Works Department might be unrepresented on the Council. The scheme of the Bill was a very serious departure from the original formation of the Council of the Governor-General of India. If the Government wanted to appoint a sixth member of Council well and good, if they could make out a case for it; but they should not take away, as was proposed in this Bill, the essential qualifications of the representatives in the Council provided for in the Act of 1874. He did not want to move the rejection of the Bill, or do anything discourteous to the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for India in a matter which the right hon. Gentleman had obviously not thoroughly considered; but he thought, as the Bill had come on that night almost by way of surprise, it should be taken at a later period of the session.

Mr. BRODRICK said it was proposed to place the Department of Public Works in the hands of two members instead of one, as the present representative was over-worked. Civil works and irrigation would be in the province of the member for revenue and agriculture, and railway works in that of the member for commerce and industry.

Mr. WHITLEY (Halifax) said he was quite mystified as to what the Bill actually meant. It had been said that this was a measure of economy, but he did not see where the economy came in if the members of Council were to be increased from five to six. Indian matters were treated very shabbily in this House, and the Secretary of State should allow the Bill to stand over, to enable the hon. Member for West Denbighshire, who had a notice on the Paper on the subject, and had something important to say in regard to it, to be present.

Mr. Caldwell.

Mr. COURTENAY WARNER (Staffordshire, Lichfield) said it had been generally understood in times gone by that it was necessary to have one man responsible in the Governor-General's Council for the Public Works in India. There might be very good reasons for the extraordinary change proposed by this Bill, but there should be some further explanation given by the Secretary of State for India.

Mr. LOUGH (Islington, W.) said that the Act of 1874 declared that one member of the Council should represent the Public Works Department. By this Bill the Government were getting rid of that statutory obligation, although the right hon. Gentleman had stated that there were to be two representatives of the Public Works Department on the Council.

And, it being Midnight, the debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed upon Friday.

NAVY (DESTROYERS).

Return ordered, "of the Destroyers built and launched since the 1st day of January, 1902, for His Majesty's Navy, in the following form:—

Names of Destroyers.	By whom built.	Speed obtained on full speed trials.	Consumption of coal per H.P. on the high speed consumption trials.	Average air pressure in the stokehole on the full speed trial.

—(*Mr. Kearley.*)

Adjourned at eight minutes after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 2nd June, 1904.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH.)

Mr. **SPEAKER** laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz.:—Alexandra (Newport and South Wales) Docks and Railway Bill [Lords]; Barrow-in-Furness Corporation Bill [Lords]; Bristol Corporation Bill [Lords]; Bournemouth Corporation (Tramways) Bill [Lords]; Filey Improvement Bill [Lords]; Great Western Railway Bill [Lords]; Holywood Tramways Bill [Lords]; North Wales Electric Power Bill [Lords]; Portmadoc, Beddgelert, and South Snowdon Railway Bill [Lords]; Preston Corporation Water Bill [Lords]; St. Mary Woolnoth Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time.

NAVAL WORKS (PORTSMOUTH BARRACKS SITE) BILL (STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE THERETO COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. **SPEAKER** laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, pursuant to the Order of the House of the 17th day of May, That, in the case of the following Bill, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz.:—Naval Works (Portsmouth Barracks Site) Bill.

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS (STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE THERETO COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. **SPEAKER** laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz.:—Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill; Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill.

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time To-morrow.

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE THERETO COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. **SPEAKER** laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Privats Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz.:—Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London) Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time To-morrow.

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS (NO STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE).

Mr. **SPEAKER** laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, referred on the First Reading thereof, no Standing Orders are applicable, viz.:—Education Board Provisional Order (Swansea) Bill; Local Government Provisional Order (No. 15) Bill; Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill.

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time To-morrow.

Chippenham Gas Bill. Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Paisley District Tramways Order Confirmation Bill. Read the third time, and passed.

Saddleworth and Springhead Tramways (Abandonment) Bill. Petition for additional Provision; referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

Commons Regulation (Oxshott) Provisional Order Bill. Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Order confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table. Bill to be read the third time To-morrow.

Land Drainage Provisional Order (Owston and West Butterwick, in county of Lincoln (Parts of Lindsey) Bill. Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Order confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table. Bill to be read the third time To-morrow.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 6)Bill. Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table. Bill to be read the third time To-morrow.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill. Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table. Bill to be read the third time To-morrow.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill. Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table. Bill to be read the third time To-morrow.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 12) Bill. Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table. Bill to be read the third time To-morrow.

Local Government Provisional Orders (Gas) Bill. Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table. Bill to be read the third time To-morrow.

London County Council (Money) Bill; New River Company Bill [Lords], Reported, with Amendments; Reports to lie upon the Table.

Chesterfield Gas and Water Board Bill [Lords]. Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

Commons Regulation (Merrow) Provisional Order Bill. Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Order confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table. Bill to be read the third time To-morrow.

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions for alteration; from Linlithgow; and Kingussie; to lie upon the Table.

HOUSE-LETTING (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Falkirk, against; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions against; from Blythswood; Falkirk (four); Gosport (two); Kelnley; Halton Lea Gate; St. John's Wood; Deal (two); Halifax; Maidenhead; Islington; Bromley Bywell; Stockport (two); Liverpool; Allendale; Hareholm; Newchurch in Rossendale; Harper Towy; Sarisbury Green; Norland; Pendleton (two); Twyford; Sheepbridge; Tilehurst; Spencer's Wood; Brimpton; Reading; Todmorden; Sheffield; Hamilton; Cardiff (sixteen); Penarth; Saffron Walden; Snitterfield; Tunstall (two); Chesterton; Camborne; Western Knowle; Urmston; Burghead (two); Stafford; Hellah; Aberfeldy; Bracknell (two); Berks; St. Helens (five); Launceston; Bathpool; Lanhargy; Coad's Green; Lewannick; Rilla Mill; Hereford; Padfield; Solihull; Tranent; Three Mile Cross; Essex; Finglesham; Tilmanstone; Eastry; Dore; Bolton (three); Colwall; Gateshead (two); Ascot; Maidenhead (two); Brighton, Hove, and Haywards Heath; Newton Abbot; Torquay (five); Brixham; Burslem; North Staffordshire Pottery Towns; Brighton; Williton; Watton at Stone; Midgley; Westmoreland; Stockwell; Wood Green; Bollington; Heanor; Ilkestone; Loscoe; Mapperley; Johnstone; Newton Heath; Adlington; Brockley; Monsall; Manchester (two); Walmer; Reading; Gunnersbury; Chesham; Westmoor; Whitefort; Newcastle-on-Tyne; Paignton; Dronfield; Stockton - on - Tees; Cathays; Batley; East Linton; Platt Bridge; Newbury (two); Hebden Bridge; Southampton; Colcar; Buckhurst Hill; Denmead; Ashington; Hawick; Cheddington; Aberystwith; Worthing; Bridgwater (three); Ammanford; Broomfield; Wells-next-the-Sea; Colne; Stopsley; Galashiels (three); Roxburgh; Llanelly (eight); Llwynhendy; National Unitarian Association; Einsbury Park; Shepherd's Bush; Bedminster; Bristol (nine); Burry Port; Kidwelly; Sandbach; Rhydlewis; Shoreham; Parkhead; Broadstone; Glasbury; Northwich; Davenham; Whitegate; Southport; Runcorn Heath; Brandon; Whitchurch; Upholland; Gorton; West Gorton;

Ashton-under-Lyne; Burnley (four); Haslingden; Porthleven; Truro; Riddings; North East Lancashire; Upper Parkstone; Hull; Walkden and Little Hulton; Gainsborough; Mount Sorrel; Longholmes; Edinburgh; Taibach; Swanage; Manselton; Loughor; Rochester; Plymouth; Chelmsford; East Hanningfield; Yorkshire; Clayton; Brentwood; Chignal and Mashbury; Bloxwich; Brandon; and Kingswood; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions for alteration; from Hawick; and Chelmsford; to lie upon the Table.

LOCAL AUTHORITIES (TAXATION AND PURCHASE OF LAND) BILL.

Petition from St. Pancras, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

METRIC WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

Petition from Kidderminster, for legislation; to lie upon the Table.

RE-VACCINATION BILL.

Petition from Wandsworth, against; to lie upon the Table.

RE-VACCINATION BILL.

Petition from Chester, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

SHOPS HOURS BILL.

Petition from Edinburgh, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

TRADES UNIONS AND TRADE DISPUTES BILL.

Petition from Bristol, against; to lie upon the Table.

TUBERCULOSIS (ANIMALS) COMPENSATION BILL.

Petition from Huddersfield, against; to lie upon the Table.

VALUATION BILL.

Petitions for alteration; from Auckland; Fareham; Atcham; Newent; Brackley; Northwich; and Strood; to lie upon the Table.

VALUATION BILL.

Petition from Hackney, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

MINES AND QUARRIES.

Copy presented; of General Report and Statistics for the year 1903, Part I. (District Statistics) Statistics of the Persons employed, Output, and Accidents at Mines and Quarries in the United Kingdom, arranged according to the Inspection districts [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

EXPLOSIVES.

Copy presented; of Twenty-eighth Annual Report of His Majesty's Inspectors of Explosives, being for the year 1903 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Return presented; relative thereto [Address 1st June; *Mr. Cochrane*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 191.]

COLONIAL REPORTS (ANNUAL).

Copy presented; of Colonial Report, No. 416 (Leeward Islands), Annual Report for 1902–3 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

The New River Company and the London Water Act.

COLONEL BOWLES (Middlesex, Enfield): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether, in view of the fact that an appeal in regard to the award in the case of the New River Company is pending in the House of Lords, he will consider the advisability of postponing the appointed day under the London Water Act until after the award has been made.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) I have received an application from the company asking that the appointed day may be deferred in their case, and I am in communication with the company and the Metropolitan Water Board on the subject.

Telegraphists' Duties in Armagh Post Office.

MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid): To ask the Postmaster-General whether telegraphists in the Armagh Post Office, after performing an eight hours duty on split or divided attendances, are compelled to return to the office to perform one hour's extra duty daily; and whether, in view of the hardship to the men by reason of the frequent attendances at the office, he will investigate the circumstances.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) I will make inquiry and communicate with the hon. Member.

Draft Scheme for Whitstable Charities.

MR. SLACK (Hertfordshire, St. Albans): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether his attention has been called to a draft scheme for the Whitstable charities, in the county of Kent, in which the income provided for the payment of teachers' salaries is diverted to the maintenance of the buildings of the Whitstable and Seasalter national school; and, if so, whether, having regard to Section 13 of the Education Act, 1902, he will withhold his approval from this scheme.

(*Answered by Sir William Anson.*) The draft scheme for the Whitstable charities has been prepared by the Charity Commission, and, so far as the educational part of the endowment is concerned, will be referred, if it has not already been referred, to the local education authority. Until I am informed further in the matter, and particularly as to the views of the local education authority, I can express no opinion upon this scheme.

Hostilities in the Country between the Niger and Cross Rivers.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he can state by whose authority, and for what reason, Major Trenchard attacked the natives of the Opopo country and burned six villages; whether three columns of men have been sent to pacify the country lying between the Niger and Cross Rivers; and what is the object to be attained by the sacrifice of human life and the expenditure involved.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Lyttelton.*) In the absence of any mention of dates, it is to be inferred that the Question refers to a patrol, conducted by Major Trenchard, with 211 native troops, between the 4th of March and the 11th of April last. The "Opopo country" cannot be traced, but a district called the "Ohoho" district was visited by Major Trenchard in connection with the patrol in the Ibibio district which, as stated in my answer to the Question put by the right hon. Member for the Forest of Dean Division of Gloucestershire on the 3rd of March,† had been sanctioned by my predecessor. The country traversed is a very wild one. The object was to take away the war guns and arms of precision in the hands of the natives, to open the district to trade, and to bring it under Government control, the natives having refused to give up criminals, and any attempt to arrest an offender being immediately met by armed resistance. The casualties on the side of the Protectorate troops were nil, and appear to have been very small on the side of the opposing natives. It was found necessary to burn a number of villages, but the huts destroyed on these occasions are not of a permanent character, and are quickly reconstructed. The districts traversed by Major Trenchard and the Ibibio patrol already referred to lie between the Cross River and the Niger, and it is to be presumed that the operations mentioned in the concluding portion of the Question are identical with these two patrols. In any case, I have no reason to believe that any active operations are at present in progress between the two rivers.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Conscription—Decision of the Government.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL (Yorkshire, Cleveland): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the Government will make any proposals to this House based upon the recommendation of the majority of the Royal Commission on the Militia and Volunteers in favour of a system of conscription.

---

† See (4) *Debates* cxxxi., 58.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): No, Sir, the Government does not intend to make any proposals to the House in favour of a system of conscription.

*MR. C. R. SPENCER (Northamptonshire, Mid): Will nothing follow from the Report of this Commission?

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: Yes, Sir; I hope that a great deal will follow from this Report.

3rd North Staffordshire Regiment—William Vernon's Case.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that William Vernon, of the 3rd North Staffordshire Regiment, although absent from duty under a certificate signed Crosthwaite, Captain, was subsequently arrested under an order signed by the same officer, on the ground that he was an absentee; and seeing that, on Vernon appearing before the stipendiary magistrate at Hanley, Staffordshire, on the 30th May, the military authorities were not represented, and that the magistrate, in ordering the man's release, expressed his strong condemnation of the action of the War Office, will he state under what circumstances the order for arrest was issued.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: No report of this case has reached the War Office. Doubtless if any error has been made, the matter will, on investigation by the general officer commanding the district concerned, be properly dealt with. I must point out to the hon. Member that he is mistaken in supposing that the action taken was initiated by the War Office.

MR. WEIR: I will repeat the Question a week hence.

Canada and Imperial Defence.

MR. CHARLES DEVLIN (Galway): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether at any time during the last three years a suggestion has been made to the Canadian Government, or any members thereof, by His Majesty's Government, or any member of same, with the view of obtaining a contribution toward the maintenance of the Army and Navy; and, if so, whether he will state if the suggestion was favourably received.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. LYTTELTON, Warwick and Leamington): The question of the relations of the self-governing Colonies, including Canada, to the Imperial Army and Navy was discussed at the Colonial Conference of 1902, and the views expressed by the Canadian Ministers will be found on pages 73 and 74 of the Parliamentary Paper relating to that Conference. There is no record of any other communication within the period named.

Imperial Council of Defence.

MR. CHARLES DEVLIN: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention has been directed to the speech of Lord Milner at Johannesburg on 28th May; whether Lord Milner's statement that all the Colonies ought to contribute towards the maintenance of the Navy was due to instructions received from His Majesty's Government; whether his advocacy of Imperialism and of the establishment of an Imperial Council received the sanction of His Majesty's Government; and, if so, when is it suggested to carry into effect the proposal to establish an Imperial Council.

MR. LYTTELTON: I have seen the account given in the newspapers of the speech referred to. Lord Milner was simply expressing his personal views, and has received no instructions from His Majesty's Government on the subject. The question of establishing an Imperial Council has not reached the stage at which it would be possible to say when such a proposal could be carried into effect.

Naval Mines.

Mr. JOHN CAMPBELL (Armagh, S.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether His Majesty's Government have made any representations to the Russian Government, if so, with what result, on the question of naval mines outside the territorial limits in the seat of war in the Far East; and whether, in view of the increased range of modern projectiles, His Majesty's Government are prepared to recognise any extension of the three-mile limit.

The UNDER-SECRETARY of STATE for FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Earl Percy, Kensington, S.): No representations of the character indicated in the first paragraph of the hon. Member's Question have been made to either of the belligerent Powers, but the subject is engaging the attention of His Majesty's Government. The answer to the second paragraph of the Question is in the negative.

The Post Office Wages Committee.

Sir JAMES WOODHOUSE (Huddersfield): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General when the Report of Sir Edward Bradford's Committee will be issued to Members of the House.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Lord Stanley, Lancashire, Westhoughton): I am not able at present to fix a date for laying the Report of Sir Edward Bradford's Committee on the Table.

Sir JAMES WOODHOUSE: Cannot the noble Lord name an approximate date?

Lord STANLEY: No, Sir, I cannot say even approximately, and I hope the hon. Member will be satisfied with the assurance I have already given that there shall be a discussion in this House on the Report, which will be laid at least a fortnight before the debate takes place.

Mr. BAYLEY (Derbyshire, Chesterfield): Is there any reason why the Report cannot be laid at once?

Lord STANLEY: I do not think all the evidence is printed, and I do not propose to lay it until I am in a position to make a statement, as I hope to be able, with respect to the course we intend to pursue in regard to it.

Vaccination Notices.

Mr. WEIR: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board if he will state whether any vaccination officers throughout the country, besides the vaccination officer at Brighton, print their own notices on the forms prepared by the Local Government Board for distribution to the parents of new-born infants; and, if so, will he state the number; and, with a view to secure uniformity on the subject, will the Local Government Board so prepare the information on the forms as to obviate further additions being made by vaccination officers.

The SECRETARY to the LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. Grant Lawson, Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk): A few instances have come under my observation in which additions have been made to the form of notice referred to. I cannot say in how many cases this has been done, but no such additions should be made without the consent of the Department. I will take note of the suggestion of the hon. Member, so that when the Vaccination Order which prescribes the form is revised, the question may be considered whether any addition to the form is desirable.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): Has any notice been taken of the conduct of these officials in printing these improper notices? Have they been reprimanded?

Mr. GRANT LAWSON: I do not know we have power to do more than call the attention of the board of guardians whose servants they are to the matter.

Ejectments on Earl Fitzwilliam's Estate.

Mr. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware (1) that a number of ejectment processes at the instance of Earl Fitzwilliam were recently heard at the Tinahely Petty Sessions; (2) can he say how many decrees were granted by the Court, and for how many years rent due;

(3) can he state how many of the tenants decreed had refused to accept the landlord's terms of sale; (4) and how many of the tenants, on receipt of ejectment notices, consented to purchase their holdings at the landlord's price.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): I am inquiring as to the number of ejectment processes heard, the number of decrees granted, and the amount of arrears due in each case, and will communicate the information to the hon. Member when received. But I am unable to give any information on the other matters mentioned which do not come under official cognisance.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR: Will the right hon. Gentleman inquire how many tenants have been served with ejectment notices because they have refused to accept the landlord's terms, and how many will be ejected in consequence?

MR. WYNDHAM; I have no official cognisance of the matter.

*MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): Will the Estates Commissioners inquire into the facts before sanctioning the sale?

MR. WYNDHAM: They have very general powers, and it is no part of my duty to direct them in the matter.

Kilbride Camp Canteen Licence.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to statements made by Mr. Fletcher Moore, D.L., when presiding at Blessington Petty Sessions on the 16th of May, to the effect that the Blessington magistrates had on the 4th of April refused to grant a licence to the canteen at the Kilbride Camp, county Wicklow, on grounds considered by the magistrates to be adequate and reasonable; and that subsequently the order for the licence was signed and granted by two magistrates, namely, Sir Henry Cochrane, who resides in Bray, a long way outside the Blessington district, and by Mr. James Shanks, who is not a magistrate for the county Wicklow; and, if so, will he say what action does he intend to take in the matter.

MR. WYNDHAM: My attention has been directed to this case, the facts of which are accurately stated. The question of the jurisdiction of one of the two justices named to grant a canteen licence in a county for which he is not a magistrate is under consideration, and I would ask the hon. Member to postpone the Question for a few days to enable me to make further inquiries.

Ardglass Herring Fishery Inquiry.

MR. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the result of the inquiry held last year at Ardglass, county Down, with reference to the close season for herring fishing, and also the result of the inquiry held several years previously.

MR. WYNDHAM: The application for a by-law was withdrawn in the course of the inquiry at Ardglass last year and no by-law was made. No similar inquiry was previously held in this locality.

Establishment by Local Authorities of Motor Services in Ireland.

MR. MACVEAGH: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state if the Government would be prepared to introduce a short Bill during the present session authorising local authorities in Ireland to levy a rate not exceeding a penny in the pound for the establishment of motor or traction services for passengers or goods, respectively, and authorising joint action between two or more such local authorities.

MR. WYNDHAM: Local authorities in Ireland have power to levy rates for the purpose of putting roads and bridges into a fit condition to carry motor traffic. But no local authorities have expressed a desire to be invested with rating powers for the purpose mentioned in the Question, and in the absence of representations from local bodies seeking such powers it would be premature to consider the subject of legislation. I may add that a suggestion has been made by the Galway County Council that the share of the county in the unissued balances of the Exchequer Contribution should be placed at the disposal of the council in relief of the proposed expenditure on such roads within the county as may be utilised in connection with the Iveagh-Pirrie Motor traction scheme. I am disposed to favourably entertain this suggestion and am considering the method by which effect may best be given to it.

Kilcoo Postal Arrangements.

MR. MACVEAGH: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware of the delay in delivering letters at Kilcoo, county Down, owing to the fact that all letters are required to pass through the Newry office; and whether steps will be taken to secure that letters passing through Castlewellan for Kilcoo will be placed in a special bag, and thus obviate the day's delay in forwarding them to Newry.

LORD STANLEY: I am not aware that there has been any delay in the delivery of letters at Kilcoo, county Down, but I will have inquiry made in the matter and acquaint the hon. Member with the result.

Galway Docks.

MR. CHARLES DEVLIN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Board of Works have recently interfered with arrangements made by the Galway Harbour Board in connection with the better lighting of the docks; and, if so, will he state what is the object of this interference on the part of the Board of Works.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY (Mr. VICTOR CAVENDISH, Derbyshire, W.): The intervention of the Board of Works is with the object of carrying out their duties and securing their rights as mortgagees and receivers of the revenues of the harbour.

MR. CHARLES DEVLIN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland at whose request was an inspector recently sent by the Board of Works to examine into the suitability and sufficiency of the lighting of the docks; by whom will the expenses of this official's visit be borne, whether he examined the lights at night; and what is the nature of the report which he has made to the Board of Works.

MR. VICTOR CAVENDISH: The inspection of Galway harbour was made on behalf of the Board of Works as mortgagees and receivers of the revenues of the harbour. The inspector is paid by the Board. His report has not yet been received.

MR. CHARLES DEVLIN: Has there been any official examination of the lights at night?

MR. VICTOR CAVENDISH: I am unable to say, as we have not yet received the report.

COLONEL NOLAN (Galway, N.): Out of what fund will the money be provided?

MR. VICTOR CAVENDISH: The fund which the Board of Works administers.

Dredger for Galway Harbour.

MR. CHARLES DEVLIN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland when the second dredger promised in connection with certain harbours in Ireland will be available; and if then the application long since made by the Harbour Board of Galway for the use of a dredger for the docks will be entertained.

MR. WYNDHAM: The first part of the Question refers to a suggestion made by me that the charge for the provision of a dredger might properly be placed on the Development Grant Estimate. If provision for the charge is made in the Estimate the application of the Galway Harbour Board would be taken into consideration.

Blocking Notices.

MR. MALCOLM (Suffolk, Stowmarket): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he will consider the advisability of taking steps to amend the Standing Orders governing Motions for the adjournment of the House in order to avoid the necessity for blocking

Notices, and to restore greater freedom of debate to the House of Commons.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): In my judgment the Rule to which my hon. friend objects is undoubtedly capable of abuse, and has, no doubt, from time to time been abused. But I do not think that a simple abrogation of the Rule would do. No man who has considered the subject has come to that conclusion; nor have I ever had suggested to me any Amendment which seemed to me at once to protect the rights of the House and to carry out the intention of the Rule to which objection is raised.

MR. MALCOLM: On occasions when the Government move the adjournment of the House for the holidays, would my right hon. friend use his influence to have blocking Notices removed?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I could not give any pledge on that subject. It has always seemed to me that possibly it might be a convenient course for the House to lay down some Rule such as that which the House adopted in regard to Votes on Account. It would be understood that the debate on the Motion for the holiday adjournment at Easter and Whitsuntide should last only for a specific period—that is, for the Afternoon Sitting —that it should not be liable to Amendment or division, and that during the hours from Question time to half-past seven no Notice should be allowed to exclude any subject from debate. But I think that in that case some notice should be given of the subjects which are to be raised. I only suggest this as the sort of Amendment which might be adopted. I could not give a pledge on the subject.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): The right hon. Gentleman says that he can give no pledge, but will he address his mind to the subject and give the House an opportunity of discussing the matter? The right hon. Gentleman is aware that the state of things now is really beyond endurance, and that there is a strong feeling in all quarters of the House upon it.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Perhaps the Prime Minister has seen two Notices on the Blue Paper of to-day, which to my mind are abuses of the Rule. I wish to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he will accord an opportunity to the House to discuss a Motion which I propose to put down, to the effect that the rule and practice of the House prohibiting a discussion of a matter previously appointed for the consideration of the House or as to which Notice of Motion has previously been given shall not apply to a Motion for an adjournment for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: My hon. friend will at once see that he refers to an entirely different subject from that of the limitations put upon discussions on Motions for the adjournment for the holidays, which, I think, is the more important of the two. With regard to giving time for a discussion on the subject, the House is aware that there is a great deal of business before it; and I am certainly not in a position to add to the pledge which I have already given in regard to affording an opportunity to discuss the subject. I may add, however, that if we are happy in our progress with the discussion of Bills now before the House I do not see why we should not find time.

The Aliens Bill.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: May I ask the Prime Minister a Question in regard to the intimation which he made a day or two ago as to the business to-morrow? The third subject which he named, I think, was the reference of the Aliens Bill to a Committee upstairs. I think he ought to be aware that there is a very strong feeling on the matter, and that, therefore, it hardly comes within the field of non-contentious measures of which he spoke. Can he not postpone it?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: With regard to the Question of the right hon. Gentleman, I hardly think that the reference to a Committee upstairs of a Bill, the Second Reading of which was passed by an enormous majority, can be described as a controversial matter within the meaning of the statement which I made to the House. What was that statement? It was broadly that I was anxious during the first week after the holidays to put as little strain as I could upon the time of hon. Members. I was abused incidentally before the holidays for making them so long. [AN HON. MEMBER: Not abused.] Well, gently criticised; and I do think that to say that on the Friday after we meet we are not to discuss the reference of a Bill to a Committee upstairs is pressing my benevolent intentions towards the House at large rather further than is perhaps quite fair.

The Finance Bill.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.): Is there any prospect of the Finance Bill being taken next week?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No, Sir, I do not think it will be taken next week.

Army Medical Vote.

DR. FARQUHARSON (Aberdeenshire, W.): Can the Prime Minister give the House an assurance of an early opportunity to discuss the Army Medical Vote in view of the great interest taken in this question, and the possible effect of delay on the supply of suitable candidates?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No doubt more time will have to be devoted to the Army Estimates, but several days have already been occupied with them, and I cannot at the present time give any promise as to when the consideration of them will be resumed.

ANGLO-FRENCH CONVENTION [EXPENSES].

Committee to consider of authorising the payment, out of moneys provided by Parliament, of any sums payable by way of indemnity pursuant to any Act of the present session for approving and carrying into effect a Convention between His Majesty and the President of the French Republic, and any expenses to be incurred in carrying the said Convention into effect (King's Recommendation signified), to-morrow.—(*Sir A. Acland-Hood.*)

ALIENS [EXPENSES].

Committee to consider of authorising the payment, out of moneys to be provided by Parliament, of the salaries and remuneration of any persons employed, and of any expenses incurred under any Act of the present session, to make provision with respect to the Immigration of Aliens, and other matters incidental thereto (King's Recommendation signified), to-morrow.—(*Sir A. Acland-Hood.*)

NEW BILL.

POST OFFICE SITES BILL.

"To enable His Majesty's Postmaster-General to acquire lands in London, Southgate, Blackpool, Leeds, and Newcastle-upon-Tyne for the public service; and for other purposes," presented by Lord Stanley; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 219.]

SUPPLY [11TH ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[MR. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1904–1905.

CLASS II.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £142,089, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Local Government Board."

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY (Somersetshire, S.) said he wished to know what had been done in regard to regulations affecting the speed of motor-cars on main roads. Under the Motor Cars Act of last session large discretionary powers were placed in the hands of the Local Government Board to settle what was to be done as regarded regulating the speed of motors on roads, and as to setting up notices warning travellers and the public of the danger of travelling beyond a certain pace. So far as he was aware, the Local Government Board had taken very little action in the matter at all, and all that had been done had been on the line of suggesting to the various local authorities that they should do nothing in the matter, but should rather rely on the section of the Act throwing the responsibility on the drivers to see that they did not run any undue risks. He regretted that the Local Government Board had not given attention to applications from local authorities for power to enforce regulations. Indeed, in one case there had been a refusal to allow any regulations to be put in force. He wished to point out to the right hon. Gentleman that there were very narrow roads, especially in the West of England—roads with many winding turnings in them, where motor-car traffic was not merely a nuisance but was really dangerous. He believed that if there were some general regulations restricting the speed to ten miles an hour, motor-cars would prefer not to use those narrow roads, but would rather make a detour over main roads, and thus the general convenience of the public would be consulted. Then again, a recommendation of the County Councils Association in regard to notices to motor-car drivers was certainly worthy of more consideration than it had received. It had been suggested that the warning notices might be suspended from the lamp-posts, but the Local Government Board had prohibited anything of the kind being done. He thought it very desirable that the Local Government Board should set up one standard for these notices so that they might be easily recognised by car drivers who were dashing about all over the country. The effect of the attitude taken up by the Local Government Board had been to induce local authorities to believe that it was not worth their while to take the trouble to make any recommendations in regard to regulations.

Then there was the question of the cost of putting up the notices. One county council had estimated that each such warning would cost about £2, and that the total cost of placing danger boards within its limits would amount to something like £8,000. Was not that a burden which should fall on the Imperial Exchequer? The right hon. Gentleman might say that that was not a matter with which he had to deal, and that it was the fault of the House if, when the Bill was under consideration, steps were not taken to throw this burden upon the Imperial Exchequer. As to that he would say nothing, but he would urge the desirability of having one standard for these notices. He had made inquiry of the Cyclists' Touring Club, and they had informed him that the cost of the iron discs which they were in the habit of distributing about the country was only 3s. 6d., and that the cost of the posts to which they were attached ranged from 5s. to 10s. Well, that would give a maximum outlay of 13s. 6d. for each signal as against £2 which had been estimated by a certain county council. But even that 13s. 6d. would not be required if the right hon. Gentleman would consent to allow the discs to be slung from the lamp-posts. There was one other point to which he would like to draw attention, and that was the damage done to the roads by traction engines travelling along the roads at ten or twelve miles an hour. These engines not only caused great obstruction in narrow lanes, but they cut up the roads in a most terrible fashion. A Departmental Committee had been appointed to go into the question, and he could not help thinking that it was a mistake that the Rural District Councils Association, which was very much interested in the matter, seeing that the rural district councils had to contribute very largely towards the expense of making and maintaining the roads used by these heavy motors, was not granted special representation upon that Committee. He hoped, however, that, as the outcome of the deliberations of the Committee, some regulations would be laid down in regard to this traffic, for it was not infrequently the case that these engines cut a rut something like nine or ten inches in depth in the road. He would like to ask the right hon. Gentleman, in conclusion, whether he had issued any regulations in regard to a speed limit for these traction engines, and he begged, in order that he might get a reply, to move the reduction of the salary of the President of the Local Government Board by £100.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Item A (Salaries and Wages) be reduced by £100."—(*Sir Edward Strachey.*)

MR. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland) said the whole crux and essence of the Bill passed last year, and of the arrangement by which that Bill received the almost unanimous consent of hon. Gentlemen of that House, was that the local authorities should be practically the masters of the situation. That point was thoroughly and fully brought out in the course of the debates, and the right hon. Gentleman almost gave a pledge that his Department would not interfere in an unjustifiable manner in reference to the control of the local authorities. For himself, he would not for a moment have pressed for a speed limit of twenty miles an hour provided the local authorities had been left alone to regulate the traffic. But matters had not been very much improved by the passing of the Bill of last year, because the local authorities had been set at nought; they had been, he would not say snubbed exactly, but their recommendations had not been treated with any respect whatever. Cases had been brought before the Department in which motor-cars must of necessity have been travelling at a speed far beyond that to which they were entitled to go by law, but the right hon. Gentleman in reply to a Question put to him in the House simply told them that he could do nothing in the matter. The whole of his attitude had been discouraging to the local authorities and had encouraged the owners and drivers of the cars to think they were promoting a British industry by careering over the roads, highways, and by-ways at the speed of express trains. The other day he was nearly run over in London within a quarter of a mile of that House, and only last Sunday a motor-car went through the village near which he resided at a speed of something like forty miles an hour. That was a serious matter, for children, dogs, sheep, and chickens had to be hustled out of the road to make room for rich men who for purposes of selfish pleasure were rendering themselves a nuisance to the whole community. It was perfectly true that the cars were under magnificent control and could be stopped nearly dead when travelling at a speed even of something like thirty miles an hour, but what had to be borne in mind was the condition of the man who was in charge of the car. It was not always the case that he was equal to an emergency. He remembered a case in his own county where a man driving a horse met a motor-car and asked that it should be stopped. It was not stopped, and his horse became very restive, with the result that in the excitement of the moment he used his whip, the end of which touched a lady, and there was a most tremendous row over the affair. He confessed that, personally, he was somewhat nervous about these motor-cars and the way they careered over the country. He thought that the right hon. Gentleman must recognise the assistance he obtained from Members on the Opposition side of the House in getting the Bill carried last year, and that assistance showed that they were not actuated by any spirit of hostility towards him. They simply asked that the roads should be used for the purposes for which they were originally constructed, and not for the pleasure of a few rich men who desired to travel about the country at express rates of speed.

MR. NUSSEY (Pontefract) asked who was responsible for regulating the traffic in London. It was very noticeable that motor-cars travelled at a terrific speed in populous parts of the Metropolis and also in the Parks. He did not hear of anyone being pulled up, and he, therefore, hoped that the right hon. Gentleman would tell them who was responsible for the regulation of the traffic, and in how many cases there had been prosecutions of motor-car drivers in the past year for exceeding the speed at which they were entitled to travel.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. WALTER LONG, Bristol, S.) said it was true that under the Act of last year large discretionary powers with regard to fixing the speed of motor-cars on roads were placed in the hands of the Local Government Board; but it was incorrect to say that he had entirely neglected the applications of local authorities for further powers, or that he had absolutely declined to consider applications to hold local inquiries. On the contrary, what he had done had been to hold local inquiries, when applications had been made, and to ascertain from his inspectors what the local requirements were. He had intimated to these local authorities that, while he was quite prepared to exercise the powers invested in him to impose a special limit in particular places where, owing to the nature of the road or the amount of the traffic, there seemed to be special danger, he was not prepared to impose the ten miles limit over the whole area. Of course, in some towns where the streets, as a rule, were narrow, it might be necessary to enforce the ten miles limit in a wider area than he would otherwise have been disposed to contemplate. He had been assured that the Act was working very satisfactorily, and that it had very materially reduced dangerous driving throughout the country. Now that the police could take the number of a car and thereby identify the owner and the driver it was no longer necessary to lay traps, a practice which nobody favoured. That was the great reform that had been carried out by the Act. After all it was rather early to judge the effects of the Act. With regard to the cost of danger boards, he was as anxious as anybody that there should be no unnecessary addition to the rates. He would inquire into the matter, and if he could in any way reduce the cost he should be very glad to do so. He was not aware that any application for permission to attach them to lamp-posts had been refused but he would inquire further into that point, although it must be remembered that lamp-posts were only available in towns and in the large villages. As to the damage done to the roads by traction engines, there was only one way of preventing that, and that was by not allowing them to use the roads at all. The damage was caused by too heavy weights being put on too narrow tires. They had had considerable experience of the harm done by them in Wiltshire during the military manœuvres. He assured the Committee that he was doing all he could to secure the loyal carrying out of the Act, and he thought that if a little patience were exercised on both sides the Act would be found to work very satisfactorily. In answer to the question of the hon. Member for Pontefract, the metropolitan boroughs were the authorities in London for making regulations under the Act, and the police were responsible for their enforcement. He could not give the number of prosecutions.

Sir EDWARD STRACHEY asked leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Mr. HENRY HOBHOUSE (Somersetshire, E.) said the hon. Member for South Somerset had complained that a certain association was not represented on the Departmental Committee which recently inquired into this question, but he could assure him that the Committee had taken the interests of the ratepayers into most careful consideration. They had endeavoured to protect those interests by making representations that a proper width of wheel for traction engines should be laid down, as the damage done to the roads depended mainly on carrying heavy weights on an insufficient width of tire. The evidence laid before them was almost unanimous on that point. There was no power to stop this class of traffic in certain kinds of weather, for it was when the roads were excessively soft and wet that the chief damage was done. He could not help thinking that if the new regulations for motor traffic followed on the lines recommended by the Committee the public would have no real cause of complaint, neither would those who were interested in what was undoubtedly a rapidly developing industry and one which might be of great use to the agricultural community as well as to other classes.

Sir CARNE RASCH (Essex, Chelmsford) urged the desirability of giving to justices the power of awarding imprisonment after the first instead of the third offence in cases where a driver had caused injury to man or beast, and had refused to stop when called upon to do so. A resolution on these lines had, he said, been unanimously passed by the Essex County Council.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Original Question again proposed.

Sir ERNEST FLOWER (Bradford, W.) said it had been customary on this

Vote in past years to raise a discussion on the subject of the treatment of children under the Poor Law. Since a Departmental Committee examined the subject in 1895, and made a sweeping condemnation of what was known as the barrack school system, interest in the matter had grown steadily, and as a result there had been a very considerable modification of the system of barrack schools. In the schools which remained there had been no doubt a notable improvement both in the condition of the schools and the character of the education imparted to the children, but still in some cases the guardians had failed to do as much as could have been desired. Still those who entertained the view that these schools did not afford the best means of dealing with these children had no reason to abandon that opinion, and he proposed to name one or two cases for the information of the President of the Local Government Board which would, he thought, afford basis for an inquiry by his Department. The first was the case of the schools under the Barnet Board of Guardians. At these schools there had, ever since 1892, been successive outbreaks of contagious diseases, and the schools had been infected as a result of the last one for a period of not less than sixteen months. Schools such as that ought to be abandoned. They were told that the history of the schools was very bad. The medical officer had reported that the sleeping accommodation was very inadequate, the dining-room having to be used for sleeping purposes, and there being no room available for purposes of isolation it was impossible to prevent the spread of the infection. Unhappily this school was not controlled by an enlightened board of guardians, and it afforded a concrete illustration of the evils which tended to flow from this barrack system. Another case of overcrowding was to be found in the West Ham schools; but there, he was informed, the guardians were endeavouring to arrange to board out some of the children, of whom there were 169 beyond the number which the schools were certified to accommodate. He had followed up this case pretty closely, and he could not find that any attempt had been made by the guardians to enforce the "call" system. As the Committee were no doubt aware, a systematic inquiry by the guardians into the particular circumstances of each child generally led to a considerable reduction in the number of children retained in the school, and he remembered that when the Whitechapel guardians resorted to that system of examination the number was reduced by a very large percentage indeed. He believed the West Ham guardians were proposing to remove some of the old inmates of their workhouse to a new building being erected in Mare Street, Hackney, and to put the children into the vacated blocks. He did not think that was at all a satisfactory way of dealing with this question. What was desirable was to get the children removed from what might be called the taint of workhouse surroundings, and he wished the Local Government Board had seen its way to point out to the guardians that the scattered homes system afforded a much happier method of dealing with this class of children. He felt that a mistake was being made in urging upon the guardians the establishment of large central institutions. They not only injuriously affected the development of the system of individual treatment for the children, but the expense of building and maintaining them was very much in excess of the outlay required for scattered homes, the more general adoption of which he trusted the right hon. Gentleman would do his best to promote in the ensuing year, for he believed such a system was fraught with advantage both to the children and to the ratepayers.

Sir Ernest Flower.

Mr. HERBERT SAMUEL (Yorkshire, Cleveland) drew attention to a circular issued advocating the emigration of Poor Law children to Canada and other Colonies. He said they were all agreed that such emigration was desirable and they wished it to prove successful. But in this connection a scheme had been proposed to which considerable objection was taken. Emigration of Poor Law children to the Colonies was desirable in order that they should have better opportunities of employment than in this country and be able to make a completely fresh start in the new land altogether free from the taint of being Poor Law children and from the drawbacks arising from their origin. A committee of delegates of the Metropolitan Poor Law Unions met to consider this matter last December, and passed a resolution declaring that a united scheme of training was desirable to fit the children for emigration and that there was a necessity for the establishment in Canada of homes or certificated schools under the auspices of the Dominion Government. He sincerely hoped that the President of the Local Government Board would not give his consent to such a proposal. At present the children were sent out to Canada through Dr. Barnardo, Miss Macpherson, the Roman Catholic Emigration Society, and other similar institutions. When they arrived in Canada they were placed in small receiving homes and afterwards drafted to various employment throughout the country, where they were subjected to visits by the inspectors of the society and of the Canadian Government. That system was quite efficient and worked very satisfactorily, but now it was proposed to practically establish a wing of the English workhouse on Canadian soil and to segregate the children and place them in a special home. There they would be inevitably labelled as Poor Law children and known as children who emanated from the British workhouse system. The cost of such a proposal would be exceedingly heavy, while the present cost of sending children out and maintaining the system of inspection was only some £20 per head. The main objection to the proposal was that it would seriously work to the detriment of the prospects of the children in Canada, because there was a certain amount of natural prejudice in the Colonies against such children, and if they were specially labelled they would be subjected to great drawbacks. The metropolitan unions were not unanimously in favour of the proposal, and several of them had passed resolutions against it, but there were persons who wished this scheme put into operation in Canada, South Africa, and other Colonies. He therefore hoped the President of the Local Government Board would assure the House that he would not consent to such a proposal.

SIR JOHN GORST (Cambridge University) said he concurred in the appeal which had been made by the hon. Member who had just sat down to the President of the Local Government Board not to establish British workhouses in Canada. He did not think this annual conversation—it could not be called discussion, because all the speeches were invariably on one side, and the President of the Local Government Board always gave a sympathetic answer—with regard to Poor Law children had been satisfactory, and he simply rose for the purpose of asking the President of the Local Government Board whether the influence of his Department could not be exercised in the direction of securing the carrying out of some of those reforms with regard to Poor Law children upon which everybody was agreed. The Departmental Committee which had been referred to sat to consider this matter as long ago as 1895, and it reported unanimously against the retention of children in the workhouses and the workhouse infirmaries, and everybody concerned with the improvement of the treatment of these children agreed that it was most desirable to get them out of the workhouse. The Committee would hardly believe that, although nine years had passed since the unanimous Report of that Committee was issued, in the metropolitan area, which was the area with which the Committee was particularly concerned, there were actually 10 per cent. more children in the workhouses and workhouse infirmaries than when the Report was issued. At the time the Committee reported there were 2,994 children in the metropolitan workhouses and workhouse infirmaries, and now there were 3,367. Besides this, there were in the provincial workhouses and workhouse infirmaries 18,873 children, which brought up the total number of Poor Law children in these places to 22,240—rather more than one-third of the total number of children at any one time under the care of the Poor Law guardians. Could not something be done by the Local Government Board to carry out the recommendations of the Committee, so that next year, when this conversation again took place, the Secretary of the Local Government Board could tell the Committee that the numbers of the children in the workhouses and the workhouse infirmaries had decreased instead of having increased ?

He also desired to call attention to the large district schools. Some people were still of opinion that that was a desirable way of dealing with these children, but the Committee reported unanimously against it; and so impressed was the Local Government Board by that Report that they came to the conclusion that these vast aggregations of children should no longer be allowed, and many of these schools were broken up, to the very great advantage of the children. Some schools, however, still flourished in spite of the Report. The Hanwell School, for instance, built for the reception of the children of Southwark and the City of London, was certified by the Local Government Board for 746 children. In May of this year there were in that school 817 children, or seventy-one more than the school was certified for. He had mentioned this fact in the debate which took place last year, when a rumour was current that the Local Government Board was to be asked to certify for a larger nnmber; but his right hon. friend then said no such certificate should be given, and, as a fact, no such certificate had been given. He had also called the attention of the Local Government Board to the fact that not only were there more than 10 per cent. more children in the school than it was certified for, but that old ophthalmic buildings, which had previously been abandoned, were being used for the reception of these children, and that the children were being taken into the schools without any period of what was called probation—a period during which the new children were kept apart from the others, so as to make sure that they were not suffering from any complaint which might be otherwise communicated to the school. It was very necessary that there should be a period of probation. He had read a reply from the Local Government Board, in which they said that they disapproved of the managers of the school dispensing with the period of probation. Nevertheless, this school, in the month of May last year, admitted eleven children without any term of probation, and subsequently admitted five more. That was one instance where a reform, which was entirely in consonance with the Report of the Committee and with the view of the Local Government Board itself, was desirable.

There were two methods by which these large district schools were being superseded, one was that of the "village community," in which the children lived in different houses instead of one high barrack and there was a playground and school and chapel and various building of that kind common to all. So far as the health of the children was concerned that system was far better than the district school, but it still had the effect of separating the children from the other children of the country and separating them from our social life. The other system was that of "scattered homes," a system under which the Poor Law children were put out in various houses in the district from which they came. They attended the ordinary schools of the district and played with the other children of the neighbourhood and were thus removed as far as possible from the taint of the workhouse, living as they did in these artificial homes. A Return made in 1902 showed that there were twenty-five village communities which were most expensive to build and to maintain, and not nearly so economical as the scattered homes, and, although he admitted that economy was not to be so much considered in a matter of this kind which so much affected the welfare of our Poor Law children, he asked why the Board, instead of being neutral in this matter, should endeavour to force the village community system upon boards of guardians who would prefer to have the scattered homes system.

Mr. WALTER LONG: We do not.

Sir JOHN GORST said that last August the Wigan Board of Guardians, after visiting Reading, Mile End, Bradford, and Leeds, where the scattered homes system was in full swing, held a meeting to consider whether they should adopt the scattered homes system and abandon a village community scheme for which they had actually secured a site. In order that the matter should not be hurried the consideration of the question was adjourned for three months. The matter was finally dealt with in January last, when, by a majority of twenty to three, they decided to adopt the scattered homes system. The Local Government Board inspector, who was present at the meeting, took part in the discussion, and vehemently urged the adoption of the village community instead of the scattered homes system.

MR. WALTER LONG: That is not the Local Government Board.

SIR JOHN GORST pointed out that the inspector was present in his official capacity, and in the *Local Government Journal* for 25th May, he was reported to have said—

> "The official view of the Local Government Board was that the best system was the group system, and it was his duty to press that view on the board, and to say that as far as his view went he entirely agreed with the Local Government Board."

What he desired to suggest was that the officials of the Board should be instructed to adopt a neutral attitude in the matter, and that where a local authority after careful inquiry and full discussion, had decided in favour of a particular course, their decision should be respected by the Local Government Board.

MR. WALTER LONG: Has the Local Government Board refused their sanction to the scheme?

SIR JOHN GORST said that sanction had not been refused, but the official of the Board had done his utmost to prevent the local authority from deciding in favour of scattered homes. But by far the cheapest and best way of dealing with Poor Law children was the boarding-out system. That system suffered from two things. One was the discouragement it always received from headquarters. He did not know whether the right hon. Gentleman would say that he encouraged boarding-out.

MR. WALTER LONG: Certainly.

SIR JOHN GORST said he was glad to hear that, because many of the regulations of the Department discouraged the system. A great number of children could not be boarded out; but many might be who were not. He had often thought that the cases of widows with large families deserved the attention of the House of Commons, but as the widows were not voters the cases received no attention, but went to form one of those social incidents which were passed over. There were two ways in which such cases were at present dealt with. Sometimes a poor pittance of outdoor relief was given, and by working herself to the bone the widow managed to scrape an insufficient livelihood and to "drag up" her children after a fashion. The more worthless and less energetic widows went into the workhouse and the children were sent to district schools or otherwise dealt with at great cost by the guardians. How much better it would be, in the case of a widow with six children, to say that she should bear the cost of two herself, while the guardians boarded out with her the other four. She would then be able to bring up her family at much less cost to the ratepayers and in a much more satisfactory manner than under the present system. The second hindrance to the boarding-out system was the inspection. He agreed that inspection was necessary, but as now carried out it was so inquisitorial that the more respectable people would not take the children. In an establishment at Cairo, founded by Lord Cromer, where the children were dealt with by adoption, every possible inquiry was made before a woman was permitted to adopt a child, but once the child was adopted it was handed over for good or for evil and no further inquiries were made. He held very strongly that the inspector should be a medical woman. On one occasion he visited some boarded-out children with Dr. Barnardo's inspector, a medical woman, and he was greatly struck by the pleasure with which she was received in every house and by the extreme value of the advice which she gave to the mothers. The inspection, though very searching and complete, was not looked upon as at all inquisitorial, and the inspector was welcomed as a friend.

He desired to protest against a practice of some years standing by which destitute children who ought to be boarded out were sent to industrial schools. In this connection he might tell the Committee a story. Eight years ago when visiting an industrial school he saw amongst all the rough boys a charming child of six years of age. He inquired what offence the child had committed, and found that he had been sentenced to be kept at an industrial school until he was sixteen years of age for the monstrous crime of being found destitute. Surely a child six years of age found destitute ought to be taken in hand by the Poor Law authorities, but, so far from this being an exceptional case, he found upon inquiry that it was the regular practice to send such children to industrial schools. He did his utmost to rescue that child. The Home Secretary, who was communicated with, did his best, but neither the authorities of the school nor the guardians would agree to the child's being taken out, although he himself offered to bear the extra cost of maintenance and education. Subsequently inquiries were made as to what had become of the boy, and he was found to be a strong boy of fourteen years of age. He was asked what he had been taught, and he stated that he had been employed all the time in the school darning stockings. Had he been under Dr. Barnardo, he might now have been on the point of going out to Canada, or at any rate he would have known some trade. The result was that this boy was turned out into the world with no other accomplishment but that of being able to darn stockings.

With regard to the question of vagrants, there was no doubt that vagrancy was on the increase. County councils, quarter sessions, and boards of guardians had all addressed the Local Government Board upon this subject and had called attention to the serious spread of vagrancy. The official statistics showed that this class numbered, according to the Poor Law Returns, 30,000, but a great many vagrants lived on commons and dragged about with them a lot of verminous children who were not included in that total, and they were a real source of danger to the country. The children in particular of the class known as "the ins and outs" could not be looked after in any way whatever. If they were put into the Poor Law schools they were taken out again in the summer time and came back again in the autumn, and they were undoubtedly the worst class the Poor Law authorities had to deal with. They did not go to the casual wards because in the summer they were well off and were a most valuable asset to tramps because children were better beggars than adults. As a matter of fact, these children were often hired by tramps, for begging purposes. The Salvation Army and the Church Army were the only institutions which appeared to be dealing with this class in this country. In America, Germany, and Switzerland labour colonies had been established for tramps, and though they had not succeeded as well as they might have wished, at all events they had done much to mitigate the evil, and they had kept the tramp class from increasing. A tramp was a diseased member of the social body who required reformed treatment. They were incapable of working as they were, but they could be taught to work. The Salvation Army had taught them to work and they could make them work. He wished to know whether the Local Government Board intended to take this question of vagrancy seriously in hand. They wanted some form of inquiry in the first instance, either by a Royal Commission or a Departmental Committee. There was a good deal to be learned upon this subject from foreign countries. Legislation might take the form of giving powers to local authorities. No time ought to be lost and inquiry ought to begin at once. Next session they should have a Bill to clothe local authorities with powers to deal with this question. He could assure the right hon. Gentleman that if he brought in a Bill it would be treated with the greatest desire to pass it through in all quarters of the House, because all hon. Members would unite in any serious effort that was made to put down this great social evil.

Mr. CROOKS (Woolwich) said he desired to associate himself with what had been said by the right hon. Gentleman opposite in regard to the control of vagrant children. Children who were brought up as beggars grew up quite useless for anything else but begging. He wished to congratulate the President of the Local Government Board upon some of the work he had done, especially in regard to education. He wanted to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he would take a personal interest in the desire which existed that the children chargeable to the various unions should have the right to go to the elementary and secondary schools outside. The Bethnal Green Guardians had under their care a clever boy who they believed might win a junior county scholarship, but because the school happened to be in the county of Essex that county had refused him admission to their school for training. He thought that was most unfortunate. He was aware that a good many children were in those schools in consequence of the thriftlessness of their parents, but if it was true that technical education was paid for out of wines and spirits, then these children had all the more claim upon these schools. Scattered homes were all very good in their way, but he did not want to see boards of guardians become competitors for houses in crowded neighbourhoods, where there was already a house famine, and where it was now extremely difficult to get houses at reasonable rents.

He was glad that for years there had been a sympathetic view taken of the claims of various localities in regard to the treatment of these children, and it had very properly been held that the locality was the best judge. Where scattered homes had proved to be the best, let them have them. Boarding-out when it was good was good, but it wanted a lot of watching and inspecting. The difficulty in connection with inspection was that sometimes it relieved the foster parents of their responsibility to some extent. He thought inspection was good, and that it ought to be carried out. What was this boarding-out system of which they had heard so much? It might be good, bad, or indifferent. He knew villages where the keeping of boarded-out children had become the staple industry. He remembered the first time he visited a village in Suffolk where there were boarded-out children, and truly he was undeceived. He had been advocating the boarding-out system, believing that the children would work into the village life, and that the workhouse taint would never visit them again. When visiting the children he was sent to look after he inquired if there were any more there. "No," was the reply, "we have no more Hackneys, but there are a few Poplars over there." He was told also that there were some "Bethnal Greens" in another place. He asked the secretary of the boarding-out committee whether, when these lads got old enough they would go to work with the farmers in the neighbourhood. He replied, "We have trouble enough to find work for our own boys. We look after them when they are young and you can get them into the Army or Navy." Who were the applicants for boarded-out children? He could give a whole list of them. They were people who had applied for outdoor relief. Instead of giving them outdoor relief the boards of guardians gave them a couple of London "kids" to look after. Assimilate with the home life of the people! Rubbish! There was nothing of the kind. He rejoiced to say that he had known people who had taken youngsters and brought them up splendidly, but these were not the people to be found in villages where boarding-out was the staple industry. He knew a case where a lady was engaged in the making of stockings, and the boarded-out children helped her. The average wage for labourers in the district was 11s. a week. The lady had four boarded-out children and received 16s. a week for them. She was the duchess of the place. She was absolutely better off than anyone else there. The hon. Baronet said these children in scattered homes were not known from the other children of the village when they went to school, but he laboured under a mistake in regard to that matter. They were known, and personally he had no difficulty in distinguishing them. He once visited a "scattered home" where there were fourteen children. Just imagine a working man's house with fourteen children under fourteen years of age. He never knew anybody who had fourteen children under fourteen years of age. When he asked the lady who was minding them if she allowed these children to go out to play, she stated that they were out a week ago. "Don't you allow them to go out to play in the street?" he asked, and the lady answered, "You've not got their heads to keep clean, I have." It was quite easy to pick out these Poor Law children in school. The ordinary child who went home to his mother did not care whether his collar had spots on it, but the boy who went to a cottage home knew that he was not going to be received with motherly love if his collar was dirty. The whole difficulty of the situation presented itself when they tried to find out the proper class of people to take charge of these children. He thought the boarding-out should be limited to certain villages and people, and that the children should always be boarded with able-bodied men and women who had one or two children of their own. In that way the system would be good.

He agreed with what the right hon. Gentlemen said about using an abandoned ophthalmic building as a school. It was a positive scandal that this should have been allowed, but the difficulty was that they could not find at five minute notice the accommodation required for these children. A school might be large or small, but according as the personal supervision was good or otherwise so would be the results so far as the best interests of the children were concerned. He rejoiced that the Local Government Board had seen their way to deal with mentally deficient children. They were always troublesome and difficult to deal with. Until a year ago, whenever children arrived at sixteen years of age, they became adults, and, no matter how backward their training had been, they had to return to the workhouse. Now they could be retained in suitable places of instruction until they were twenty-one years of age, and an amount of success had been achieved in educating that class which formerly would hardly have been dreamt of. He could testify to the good which was being done in this direction. Reference had been made to the number of children in workhouses and infirmaries as compared with a few years ago. He dared say that there had been an increase in the number of sick children, but that was because they had been removed for treatment from the slums in great cities. In order to ascertain the true state of matters in regard to these children they should find out how many were "ins and outs," and how many were permanently there. In Yorkshire some years ago a Poor Law child captured a junior scholarship in a technical school, and he was going on to try to get a senior scholarship. He regretted that boy was not a London child. The right hon. Member for Croydon got a clause inserted in the Juvenile Offenders Act to enable the magistrates to place children under remand elsewhere than in the workhouse. But a step farther should be taken. When a child, six years old, was charged with being a wanderer it was sent to a reformatory instead of to the workhouse. But that was a mere shuffle. Instead of being sent to Holloway Gaol for the night, these children ought to be sent to remand homes where the magistrate might go and deal with them instead of their being brought to the Police Court. He would like to ask how it was that when there were these remand homes in London certain children were dragged off to the provinces? The provincial guardians had no more right to neglect their duty in this respect than the London guardians.

Again, he would like to know how it was that when an East End union desired to give an increase of salary to a deserving officer the Metropolitan Poor Law Commissioners invariably refused it. What he was afraid of was that these Metropolitan Poor Law Commissioners lived in West End parishes and did not want to contribute to the expense of the East End parishes. They said that they had no objection to the East End parishes granting an officer a gratuity or raising his salary, but that that must be charged to the local rates. That was manifestly unfair. Why should the extra cost be put on the poor localities? Here, in London, there were cities of the poor and cities of the rich. It was to the advantage of the State, he supposed, that there should be industrial communities at one end and, should he call it, idle communities at the other end living in delightful quarters where there was no smoke or worry to upset their nerves. But what about the worries and woes of the poor widows and children in the East End, where they were compelled to aggregate? Was it unreasonable to say that the rich and poor localities should be put together, and a common charge should be made on them for extra services? One of the best officers he knew had not got a rise of salary for fifteen years, and he was told he might get another rise after five years more service. Another point was sending children into the workhouse. Why should they not be left in the care of their widowed mothers, if they were respectable? A contribution was made for these children from the common fund by the Metropolitan Poor Law Commissioners if they were in the workhouse schools, but why should not 9d. a day be given for those who lived with their mothers, instead of in the workhouse schools, which were overcrowded? If that were done it would brighten many a home. He also wanted the Local Government Board to insist that in sick asylums and infirmaries there should be no pauper help; that there should be fully-qualified paid labour to look after the patients. There had been great improvement in the administration of the Poor Law during the last ten or twelve years, but he hoped that the appeal made that afternoon for still further improvement would not be in vain.

*MR. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton) said he sincerely hoped that his right hon. friend would be able to follow up what he had in comtemplation in regard to carrying out the reforms urged upon him. He himself was keenly interested in the question of vagrant children. He believed, with his right hon. friend the Member for Cambridge University, that little good could be done for these under the existing law; and he hoped that next session matters would be put on a footing to enable the House to deal with this question. He was anxious to know, in consequence of an answer he had received to a Question on 2nd May last, what progress had been made in carrying out an important clause of the Housing of the Working Classes Act, by which the duties relating to the administration of all the Housing Acts should be concentrated in the Local Government Board instead of being divided as now between the Local Government Board and the Home Office. Surely the ingenuity of the Treasury, the Local Government Board, and the Home Office could have brought about that concentration, and he emphasised the keen disappointment of all who had housing reform at heart at the undue delay. He dared say that his right hon. friend might reply that the delay in the transfer was due to the fact that in the particular clause of the Act the sacred word "may" was inserted instead of "shall." He sincerely trusted that the President of the Local Government Board would not hide himself behind the word "may" and that only a very short time would elapse before the concentration was made.

There was another point of very considerable importance as to which a great deal of discussion had taken place. He referred to the clause in the Act dealing with loans. Owing to the Public Works Loans Commissioners being permitted to advance money for a shorter period than provided by the Act it was rendered somewhat nugatory. Rehousing administration, which the Act placed in the hands of the right hon. Gentleman, was another subject upon which no information had been forthcoming, and he would ask the right hon. Gentleman to tell the Committee what he had been able to do under the Act of last year. If the right hon. Gentleman was not able to do that it might be possible to initiate a set of Returns, brought up to date, which would give some information on this subject to show how far this administration had been beneficial or otherwise. It was very difficult to get any practical information on the subject of insanitary areas, and upon this subject it would be most beneficial if the Local Government Board could see its way to keep up a set of Returns in the same way as did the Board of Trade in respect of various matters relating to trade and to labour. He admitted that the suggestions he made would not be easy to carry out so long as the work of the Local Government Board was distributed in the manner in which it was at the present time. He ventured to point out that there was not a single officer whose whole time was given to housing. The various duties with regard to the housing of the people were distributed over a great number of officers, and there was not one officer whose salary and whose duty related entirely to this important subject. He contrasted this state of things with that which obtained at the Board of Trade in connection with certain labour matters, where there were men whose official duty was concentrated on a particular subject instead of all these matters being muddled up together as was the case at the Local Government Board. The officers of the

Local Government Board were, he was quite aware, most industrious, and the fault did not lie with them but with the system. They were bound up with red tape. He was quite satisfied that the time had arrived when public opinion would value very highly a statement from the right hon. Gentleman which would indicate that there had been great progress made with the reorganisation of his Department. At the same time the right hon. Gentleman might be able to inform the Committee whether he had received the Report of the Committee appointed to consider the reorganisation of the duties of his Department of the Board of Trade and other public Departments.

Mr. WALTER LONG: The Committee has not reported.

*Mr. CLAUDE HAY said the right hon. Gentleman had also promised some time previously to appoint a Departmental Committee to deal with the question of vagrants' children and also a Royal Commission to deal with the question of vagrancy itself. Neither of those two bodies were yet in operation and the right hon. Gentleman would perhaps acquaint the Committee with the decision at which he had arrived in regard to those promises, because, although these questions might not excite a great amount of interest inside the House, there was a growing opinion outside which took deep interest in them and which looked with great disfavour upon any delay in carrying out reforms which were absolutely necessary if the housing of the poor and evils of vagrancy were to be improved.

*Mr. JOHN HUTTON (Yorkshire, Richmond) expressed the hope that the President of the Local Government Board would take up the question of vagrancy most earnestly. It was a very difficult problem and one which required further investigation. At the present time there seemed to be a competition between the boards of guardians and the prison authorities as to how this class should be treated. The vagrants apparently found the policy of the prison authorities the kinder of the two, and the result was that our prisons were full and the boards of guardians were only too glad to see the cost of the maintenance of the vagrants taken off their hands. He would also like to ask whether the right hon. Gentleman had considered the case of the imbecile and weak-minded at present in the workhouses, and whether he would be able to hold out some hopes that he would be prepared to deal with that question shortly. With regard to the general condition of the workhouses throughout the country, it was possibly thought that he (Mr. Hutton) had exaggerated the condition of the rural workhouses. He had always maintained on every opportunity that the condition of some of our workhouses was a disgrace to the country. If the right hon. Gentleman would appoint a Committee consisting not only of officials of the Local Government Board, but also of some experienced gentlemen from outside the Department with at least two competent ladies, who should have an opportunity to visit the various workhouses in different parts of the country, to ascertain for themselves whether the facts he had stated were correct or otherwise, then if it was discovered that things were as bad as he had pointed out no one would be more glad to be able to put them right than the right hon. Gentleman, while if on the other hand it was found that he (Mr. Hutton) had exaggerated the case then he would be only too happy to withdraw all he had said.

*Sir A. HAYTER (Walsall) said he was most anxious to emphasise his earnest and cordial sympathy with what had been stated by the Member for Cambridge upon the other side of the House. He had determined to bring the matter before the House himself because the question of vagrancy at the present moment was in a very critical position. He was able to speak from experience, since he happened to be a magistrate for Berkshire, which was in what was described as the home circuit for vagrancy. The number of vagrants had very largely increased in that county owing to race meetings which took place in the neighbourhood. It was, however, not only on account of the vagrants themselves but also on behalf of the poor children dragged about with them, that something ought to be done. This question had been under the consideration of the Lincolnshire

Quarter Sessions, who had issued a very valuable report upon the present mode of dealing with offences against the Vagrancy Act. They appointed a committee to see if any changes in the present Act were necessary and if it were desirable to establish labour colonies to which magistrates would have the power to sentence habitual offenders. The only difficulty in the way of dealing with vagrants was through their hatred of steady labour. They hated anything like a steady day's work, and the benefit of labour colonies such as had been established by the Salvation Army and in Belgium, was that they gave a man ten hours steady labour per diem: they taught him to work on a farm or gave him manufacturing and industrial employment which fitted him for an industrial life. No good was done by putting vagrants in prison, because they were not afraid of that treatment and said, as a man once said in his union, "I have never done a day's work in my life, and please God I never shall." The committee reported to the Lincolnshire Quarter Sessions in favour of approaching Parliament with the object of initiating legislation for the amendment of the Vagrancy Law either by way of establishing labour colonies or by other means. He knew perfectly well that the matter would require serious consideration because at the present time magistrates had no power to send vagrants to such colonies. He thoroughly endorsed the suggestion of the right hon. Gentleman the member for Cambridge University for establishing labour colonies in this country. The difficulty had been solved in Belgium by those means. The first offenders were not there regarded as criminals; but in the case of second offenders there was power to order a detention ranging from two to seven years for professional beggars and other classes of vagrants. He cordially recommended the report to the President of the Local Government Board, and hoped that the right hon. Gentleman would give some hopes that there would be some systematic treatment of vagrants in the future, and that, if necessary, he would prepare a Bill on the subject for next session.

* **MR. T. W. RUSSELL** (Tyrone, S.) said he had noticed with considerable satisfaction that so far as Poor Law children were concerned, what he might call the area of attack had considerably diminished. For many years the debates on the subject had been very fruitful. In the past the large school at Sutton was the main object at which criticism was levelled. The word Sutton was not, however, mentioned that afternoon, because, as he understood, the school had altogether disappeared. He should like to learn from the President of the Local Government Board what had become of the children sent by London unions to that school, and, secondly, what had happened to the enormous buildings erected for their accommodation. With reference to Hanwell school charges were made against it last year or the year before. It was alleged that the accommodation for the children had been increased, but he did not think that that was the fact. He thought it was the kitchen accommodation that had been increased. That was practically the only barrack school attacked that afternoon and he thought that was a testimony to the work the Local Government Board and the local guardians had been doing during the last few years. As regarded Wigan the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridge University complained that the Local Government Board had not left the question of scattered homes and village communities an open question. But the scattered homes system was practically a recent development. Up to a few years ago the only experiment of the kind was at Sheffield. Two years ago the Camberwell Board of Guardians made the experiment, and he could quite understand the inspector of the Local Government Board, who he knew was a most competent official, advocating a system of village communities which had been tried and had succeeded and for which a site had actually been purchased by the Wigan Guardians. In regard to the whole question of the treatment of those children the Committee ought to recollect that that was a matter on which the Local Government Board had no coercive powers. It was a question for the local authority, and all the power the Local Government Board had was of an indirect character. Hon. Members knew perfectly well that the question of the rates was a very serious

question in all those cases, and, having regard to the large Imperial and local expenditure now existing, he thought that the Committee should not ask the Local Government Board to recommend any scheme of great expenditure against the wishes of the local authority. Either the local authorities should be given local government or they should not, and the Committee ought to make up their minds which horse to ride.

The only other question he would mention had reference to the education of those children. For years it had been a burning question. Deputation after deputation had waited on the Local Government Board and the Board of Education asking that the inspection of the schools in which those children were educated should be placed in the hands of the Board of Education, and taken out of the hands of the Local Government Board. The Local Government Board had no facilities for testing the educational progress of the children and he saw no reason why the children should be differently treated from children in the ordinary schools. He should like to know from the right hon. Gentleman whether any change in that respect had taken place and, if so, what had been done in regard to it. It was a question which had caused a great deal of feeling. He only wished to add that those debates in the House of Commons for eight or nine years had been most fruitful of good for the children, and if the Local Government Board would only continue to exercise the legitimate pressure it could apply, the time would soon arrive when the children would be taken out of the workhouses altogether and provided for in separate homes or cottage homes.

Mr. THEODORE TAYLOR (Lancashire, Radcliffe) said that the vagrant population was rapidly increasing. In 1900 the mean average number of casual paupers relieved was 9,400; in 1902 it was 10,793; and in 1903 it was 12,963; or an increase of 30 per cent. in three years. There was no doubt that there was a tendency on the part of vagrants to prefer prison to the vagrant wards; and but for that tendency the increase would be greater than it was. This was a very serious question, which was arousing the anxiety and dread of many boards of guardians throughout the country; because vagrants spread infectious diseases, particularly smallpox. It was a very serious financial question so far as many local authorities were concerned. The great bulk of vagrants were not genuine out-of-works at all; they were looking not for work, but for as good a time as they could get without work. That view was shared by most of the inspectors of the Local Government Board, and a striking instance was given by one of the inspectors. A tradesman in a small town in Somersetshire applied to the poorhouse for six working men. Six, all professing to be anxious for work were supplied, but, although the wages offered were eighteen shillings a week, only one man turned up, and he was working there still. That was probably about the proportion; not more than one-sixth of the vagrants really wanted work. The question of how to deal with the out-of-works who wandered about the country was one of the most serious aspects of the social problem. When localised and living in the workhouse for a while they could be dealt with to a certain extent, but there must be something wrong with the social system under which men preferred prison to the tramp ward, and it was really one of the most important questions to which a Minister of the Crown could address himself. He earnestly urged the President of the Local Government Board, who had done good work during his short tenure of office, to take up this question of vagrants. It was not that vagrants were made too comfortable; he believed boards of guardians did their best to discourage vagrancy. There had recently appeared a pamphlet by "A Lady Amateur Casual," which perhaps the right hon. Gentleman had seen. The daughter and the wife of a clergyman, in the course of a five days tramp through Yorkshire and Lancashire, had experience of two workhouse tramp wards, two common lodging-houses, and one women's shelter, and the last-named was the only place in which anything like decency or cleanliness was observed. It was a great blot on the Poor Law system that paupers should be permitted to have charge of the lodge of admission. At each of the workhouses to which they applied these two ladies were improperly accosted, and in one case personally assaulted, by the pauper in charge of the lodge. Such a state of things was almost incredible. It appeared to be due to lax local administration, for which the Local Government Board could not be blamed, but he mentioned it in order that it might be more publicly known, and in the hope that the right hon. Gentleman would instruct his inspectors to look into the matter.

MR. WALTER LONG: That was done as soon as the occurrence came to our knowledge.

MR. THEODORE TAYLOR said he was very glad to hear it. Other irregularities were discovered to which attention should be paid, and if the right hon. Gentleman desired to ascertain the views of one of the ladies he would be glad to arrange an interview. He fully agreed with the remarks of the hon. Member for Walsall as to the desirability of dealing with the socially unfit men who had become so demoralised by begging that they had got out of the habit of working. Great national economy could be effected by converting these men, as had been done in Germany, Holland, and Belgium, through the instrumentality of labour colonies, from parasites upon the community into producers of wealth and honest working men. This was in no sense a Party question, and should he be a Member of the House when a Minister of the Crown introduced a Bill to deal with the question on the only possible lines—viz., by the establishment of labour colonies—no matter to which Party the Minister belonged, he would give him his heartiest support.

*MR. TOULMIN (Bury, Lancashire) associated himself with the remarks which had been made on the question of vagrancy. The aspect which had chiefly impressed him was that of the sufferings of the children associated with vagrants. In the picturesque and forcible speech of the hon. Member for Woolwich there was much with which he agreed, but in some points he was unable to follow the hon. Member. The workhouse taint, of which the hon. Member for Woolwich had complained was not removed by the scattered homes system, was not a name, but a system of education; it was not that a child was called a pauper child, but that he was brought up amid associations which did not bring out the best that was in him—among the moral and physical failures of the population. In the large buildings everything was done for the child; he never saw anything of ordinary home life, and could do none of the little errands and so forth that were entrusted to children of the industrial population. He believed the instances given by the hon. Member for Woolwich in which children were boarded out with people instead of relief being granted were altogether exceptional, and rather than an argument against boarding-out they were an illustration of a gross misuse of power by a particular board of guardians. A year ago the President of the Local Government Board held out the hope that the boarding-out Order might be extended. Would the right hon. Gentleman say whether anything had been done in that direction? It was a regrettable fact that boarding-out beyond the union, which was the most valuable method of dealing with difficult cases, had declined, probably in consequence of the limits put to the payments under the regulations of the Board. For instance, a clothing allowance of £2 a year for a growing boy was altogether inadequate. Twelve months back, in reply to a Question, the right hon. Gentleman stated that it was impossible for children adopted under the Poor Law Act of 1899 to be brought under the boarding-out Order. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman had further considered the subject, because some of the objections advanced on the former occasions were capable of removal. It was very improbable that parents of the children of the class which ought to be boarded out beyond the union would trace the children if they were sent to a sufficiently distant place. It was essential that their old associations should be absolutely cut off and the method of boarding-out had always seemed to him to be the best. The present boarding-out Orders were made fifteen years ago and the circumstances had very much changed, and in his opinion the time had arrived when the right hon. Gentleman ought to consider whether those Orders could not be revised. The Local Government Board had considerable power in preventing boards of guardians from taking certain courses, and they might prevent them engaging in large schemes for village communities, or other more expensive methods of dealing with children. These village communities were sometimes established in proximity to the workhouse, and there appeared to be a wobbling of judgment in this matter. Not long ago the Kidderminster Guardians asked permission to build children's quarters on their own land at some distance from the workhouse, but permission was refused. Recently the Poor Law inspector had informed the Kidderminster Guardians that if they would again submit their scheme to the Local Government Board it might receive favourable consideration. He trusted that the policy of the Local Government Board in this matter would not be reversed and that they would continue to insist upon the removal of the children as far as possible from the workhouse. He should like the right hon. Gentleman to tell the House whether he could not extend the boarding-out system.

Mr. WALTER LONG said the debate had ranged over a very wide area. He agreed with what the hon. Member for South Tyrone had said in regard to the undoubted improvement which had been made in providing for pauper children. They were all agreed that they ought to do all they could to increase the number of children educated and trained away from the workhouse and that they should leave as few as possible in the workhouse. It was not necessary to trouble the Committee with figures because hon. Members were familiar with the facts of the case. The improvement he had alluded to had been steadily growing in recent years and a comparison of the figures now with ten years ago would show that the number in the workhouse infirmaries were steadily decreasing. Where provision for the children was made in the workhouse buildings they were becoming fewer, and the energy of the Department would be devoted to the promotion of an object which they all agreed was desirable in the interests of the children and of the community. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridge University quoted the case of the Wigan Board of Guardians, but the extract he had read showed that what he stated was not the view of the Local Government Board. The inspector said he spoke the official mind of the Department, but when the Department were approached they gave their assent, and therefore it was obvious that the inspector, however much he might have been justified in his statement, was evidently mistaken, because when the application was made to the Department consent was immediately given and the Local Government Board adopted in that case, as they did in almost every case, the very line suggested by his right hon. friend. He had been asked why the Department could not be neutral in this matter. As far as he was concerned he had never spoken upon this question without stating quite clearly that that was the position they would take up. He agreed with the hon. Member for Woolwich that the circumstances in each case ought to be separately considered, and, whether scattered homes, village communities, or larger schools were asked for, in each case they must deal with the circumstances, and it would be impossible for any Government Department to force upon boards of guardians the adoption of any one of these particular remedies against their own wishes and views. Boards of guardians took an immense deal of interest in their work and endeavoured to ascertain what was the best way to deal with the paupers in their charge, and, having made up their minds that scattered homes, or village communities were the best, any attempt on the part of the Department to force them to alter their view would be sure to do more harm than good. With regard to lady inspectors he agreed that they were doing admirable work, and he thought it would be desirable if a vacancy occurred that they should appoint another lady inspector. If the work was to be really efficiently and scientifically done it was advisable to have one of those lady medical inspectors which had been referred to.

During the debate they had had a revival of some of the cases which had been constantly quoted. There was the case of Hanwell in the central London district, where there were a great many more children than the school was certified for and where the managers were dispensing with the system of probation. There again the Department came into conflict with the local authority. The figures were not quite so bad as his hon. friend seemed to think. The managers of these institutions were confronted with a very difficult problem, for they must either provide accommodation for a number in excess of the certificate or else they must keep them in the workhouse. Provided there was no serious overcrowding and the accommodation was reasonably satisfactory, he thought it was far better that the number actually certified should be exceeded than that the children should be left for any length of time in the workhouse. The figures which had been given by his right hon. friend were for May, but the total number of the children on the 28th of May was 784, forty-two of which were in the infirmary. Therefore, the number in the school buildings was 742, and that was by no means unsatisfactory. With regard to the probation system, they disapproved of that change in policy and they were doubtful whether it was a wise one or not. The managers of the schools had very strong views on the subject, and they had behind them the opinion of their medical officer, and so they were being allowed to try this experiment. The Department would not, however, approve of this course unless some very strong reason for the change were brought forward. He was confident that in no single case could it be shown that the Department had sanctioned the extension of the large barrack-schools system, except it was some extension for improving existing accommodation, and even in such cases they had reduced the number allowed by the certificate.

His hon. friend the Member for South Tyrone asked whether they had dealt with the vexed question of the inspection of Poor Law schools. He was happy to say that the President and the Vice-President of the Board of Education had been good enough to meet him half-way in this question, and that the Board of Education had taken over the inspection of the Poor Law schools, which in future would be on exactly the same footing as regarded examinations as the other elementary schools in the country. They had been long in settling this matter, but he was very glad that they had succeeded and that the educational inspection would now wisely be separated from the inspection of buildings and general Poor Law administration. The hon. Member for Woolwich had dealt with a difficulty with which London Members were very familiar—the constant applications made to the Local Goverment Board to allow the guardians to increase the salaries of their officers. The hon. Member appeared to forget that London enjoyed a common fund for local government purposes, and that the burden of the poorer districts was considerably lightened by contributions from richer districts. It was obvious that there must be some standard of salaries all over the area, and that it would be unjust to allow salaries to be paid in one portion of that area which were altogether out of proportion to the salaries paid in the other portions when they were all charged on the same fund. Therefore the Board adopted the fair system, which he saw no reason to alter, of sanctioning a general standard of salaries, and of making any local authority which gave an additional sum to its officers meet the charge out of the local rates.

His hon. friend the Member for Hoxton asked some questions with regard to the housing of the working classes. The hon. Member took a very active interest in the Department with which he himself was concerned. He had had ten years experience of the Department, but his hon. friend seemed to know more about it than he did. What the hon. Member said would be very interesting if correct, but it was not. He said there was no one connected with the Department who had charge of the housing question. He could assure his hon. friend that he was wrong. He did not think the hon. Member would find more "red tape" in connection with the Local Government Board than any other Department. Red tape was only, after all, the necessary precaution which must be taken in the carrying out of the administrative work of a Department. There must be some record of the work they were doing. The work of the Local Government Board was divided into different departments, and the housing question was taken charge of by one of those departments, but if the hon. Member desired that there should be one secretary in charge of that work he would know, if only he had a few minutes experience of the work of the Department. that that would involve a waste of time. He had been in communication with the Public Works Loans Commissioners on the subject, and he would point out that the Commissioners were not the only people from whom money could be borrowed by the local authorities. They could borrow on very satisfactory terms in other ways. They could borrow from the Public Works Loans Commissioners if they were willing to lend, but the Committee were aware that they were not anxious to lend money in small amounts, and in matters of this kind they had to deal with the money at their disposal as they thought best. His hon. friend had further asked whether some sort of Return could be given showing what had been done by the Local Government Board in regard to housing. If he could meet the wishes of the hon. Member in any way he would be very glad to do so.

*Mr. CLAUDE HAY repeated his question as to whether the administration of the Housing Acts had been entirely transferred to the Local Government Board.

Mr. WALTER LONG said his Board would be willing to relinquish the work, but obviously there would be natural reluctance on the part of the Home Office to take it over. It would be more satisfactory if it could be arranged to have a fair exchange in the way of taking over some work at present done by the Home Office for the work done by his Department in regard to housing. He was anxious to see that change made, and he hoped the fact that the subject had been mentioned that day would act as a spur, and that they might be able to do something very soon. He quite agreed that it was desirable the work should be in the hands of one Department, and that it should not be dealt with by divided authorities.

The only other question which had been referred to was a very difficult one indeed, namely, the question of vagrancy. The Government had appointed an Inter-Departmental Committee, representing the Home Office and the Local Government Board, to deal with that question. It had been treated in the discussion very much as if it were a local government question alone; but it was not so, for probably not more than 25 per cent. of the total vagrants in the country came under the Poor Law administration. The remainder were not paupers in any form, and did not take refuge in pauper institutions, and the question of dealing with them was a conundrum which could only be solved after careful consideration. Many attempts had been made to deal with this question. Reference had been made to the labour colonies in Belgium. There were several labour colonies in different parts of the Continent, and one of his inspectors who was probably as competent and experienced in matters of Poor Law administration as any official in the country, had more than once visited the countries in which these labour colonies existed, and only the other day he made a further report on the subject. The inspector, he thought, had not much hope of good results from the establishment of labour colonies. It was true that in some cases labour colonies might serve to redeem those who were young enough and were willing to be redeemed, but he was afraid that the majority of the men and women who were described as vagrants would not respond to any remedy of that kind. These, however, were matters that must be left for the Committee to report upon after they had heard the evidence of those who were competent to speak on the matter. He could promise that there would be no avoidable delay in setting up the Committee, and that it would have the freest hand in its inquiry. He agreed with everything that had been said as to the incalculable mischief done by these vagrants. They seemed to terrorise the wives of cottagers in lonely parts of the country, while the husbands were away at work, extorting food, and even money sometimes. They were unquestionably a curse and a pest to society.

As to the proposal to send children abroad, speaking for himself, he recognised the desirability of sending children to any colony, such as Canada, where they were likely to be well cared for; but anyone who had studied the question must realise that the colonisation plan was attended with risks, and might prove a curse rather than a blessing to some children. His hon. friend had asked whether he would appoint a Committee to examine into the inspection of workhouses. He did not think there was a case for a Committee, or that there was anything to justify it up to the present time. He would, however, consider any further information which the hon. Gentleman who had referred to the matter might lay before him. His hon. friend behind him made an inquiry as to outdoor hospitals for consumptives. He believed that there were two of them, that at Skipton, and another provided by the joint unions of Liverpool; and he understood that they had done very good work. So far as he knew, there was an inclination on the part of boards of guardians to unite and set up such hospitals, and the Department would be glad to do anything it could to help the guardians in work of this character. As to the extension of boarding-out, he was of opinion that the Order might be extended partially, although there had been some practical difficulties in the way. At any rate, he thought the orphan cases might be dealt with by the boards of guardians.

MR. KEARLEY (Devonport) said he wished to congratulate the right hon. Gentleman on the satisfactory answers he had given to questions in regard to Poor Law administration; but he was afraid he would not be able to continue in the strain of praise as to the administration of the Department in regard to the Adulteration Acts, especially in London. He had made a similar complaint last year, but he was sorry to say that instead of an improvement having taken place, the laxity in the administration had been rather aggravated. Under the Act of 1899 the President of the Board of Trade was given exceptional powers to take such steps as were necessary to stamp out the adulteration of the food supply of the people. For the first time the Board of Trade, in association with the Board of Agriculture, was given power to coerce the local authorities which did not carry out the provisions of the Adulteration Acts. He might go further and say that it was generally understood that the Department of the right hon. Gentleman would not only constitute itself a coercer of the defaulting local authorities, but constitute itself an intelligence department, in regard to all these matters of adulteration, to which public analysts and local authorities could look with confidence for information and advice. He wished to direct attention chiefly to the great amount of adulteration which took place in milk. The percentage of adulteration for all food products was 8·8 per cent., and he was glad to say that that percentage had been speedily falling since the Act of 1885. But the adulteration of milk, he was sorry to say, had been steadily rising during the past few years, and the percentage of adulteration at the present time was 11·6. In London the evil was more marked than in other parts of the kingdom. The percentage for the twenty towns which came next in order of size to London was 10·3; but in London the percentage was 15·6, and in six of the leading Metropolitan boroughs it was 28 per cent In Hackney and St. Pancras it was 32 per cent., in Shoreditch it was 29 per cent., in Poplar it was 22 per cent.; but the average for the six leading Metropolitan boroughs was 28 per cent. The right hon. Gentleman had laid down a standard of purity for milk which the public analysts thought unduly low. The most prevalent form of adulteration of milk was the addition of water, but preservatives and colouring matter were also introduced. The latest available information in the Report of the Local Government Board showed that 50 per cent. of the diarymen of London introduced preservatives into their milk. A Departmental Committee was appointed by the right hon. Gentleman in association with the Board of Agriculture to inquire into this very question of the introduction of preservatives and colouring matter into food products. That Committee made most startling recommendations, they recommended that the use of formalin in food or drink should be absolutely prohibited; that the use of preservatives or colouring matter in milk should be made an offence under the Sale of Food and Drugs Act; and, above all, that a Court of reference should be established to supervise the use of preservative and colouring matter in food. What steps had the right hon. Gentleman taken to give effect to those recommendations, and to stamp out this hideous adulteration which was taking place in the metropolitan boroughs. The right hon. Gentleman had taken no steps whatever. His record for the past year was no better than his record for the preceding year. Really it was a mere farce for the House of Commons to be wasting time in passing Acts of Parliament if the Minister who was responsible for putting them into force failed to do so. Why did not the right hon. Gentleman take the slightest notice of the Report of the Departmental Committee, when, by a mere stroke of his pen, or the mere publication of an Order, he could have given effect to that valuable Report.

He would suggest that, as regarded London at all events, if the right hon. Gentleman was not prepared to carry out the responsibility which the House of Commons looked to him to perform, he should hand over the responsibility to the London County Council. At present, each metropolitan borough was responsible only to itself; but if the London County Council had the power they would soon teach Hackney and St. Pancras that they could not continue to disregard with impunity the powers given to them. It was a standing disgrace and discredit that this infamous swindling should be allowed to continue almost at the very door of the Local Government Board. What happened when the Acts were properly administered? In Salford, a few years ago, a similar state of things existed. The local authorities determined to stamp it out; and they gradually got the percentage of adulteration down until now it was as low as 2 per cent. The right hon. Gentleman was familiar with the question, because he himself had raised it in previous years. What was wanted was a man belonging to the Local Government Board, or some other Department, who would not consider it beneath his dignity to make a name for himself in connection with stamping out adulteration. He did not know of any higher ambition to which a man could aspire than to secure a pure food supply for the community. He saw a skit in the *Westminster Gazette* a few months ago, with the legend, "He gave us cheap food." Who would earn the reputation of giving us pure food? He would suggest to the right hon. Gentleman that he should look to his laurels in this matter, and enforce on the local authorities their duty under the Acts. The Local Government Board had not at hand experts to advise them. The ways of the adulterators were devious, and wanted following and watching. No sooner was one form of adulteration stopped than another asserted itself. If the Local Government Board were really in earnest in the matter they would have a committee of experts to advise them; and on their advice the right hon. Gentleman by merely issuing an Order in Council could set up a standard of purity, or whatever else was required. He had spoken rather strongly, for he was sure that the right hon. Gentleman did his best to administer his Department. That Department had a great deal of work to perform; and he should like to see this important question transferred to another Department which could give more time to it. He was not suggesting that the right hon. Gentleman did not attend to the duties of his Department; but the right hon. Gentleman should put his shoulder to the wheel. He wished he had an opportunity of telling the right hon. Gentleman how it could be done. It was by no means difficult. Last year the right hon. Gentleman suggested that the very worst thing that could be done would be for the Local Government Board to step in and take over the responsibilities of the local authorities, and that it was the office of the Department to take steps to induce them to act on their own responsibility. He would be very glad if the right hon. Gentleman would give the Committee some information as to what steps he had taken and what he was prepared to do further.

THE SECRETARY TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. GRANT LAWSON, Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk) said that perhaps he might be allowed to reply. The hon. Gentleman stated that nothing had been done as a result of his speech last year. He could assure the hon. Gentleman that that was not so. The very next day after that speech was delivered the Local Government Board had a consultation with the Board of Agriculture, which naturally looked after the adulteration of milk and butter, because they had experts at their disposal, which the Local Government Board had not, as to whether any alterations should be made in the existing arrangements, and papers were then obtained showing what the Board of Agriculture had done in the matter in 1901 and 1902. The chief inspector of the Board continually visited the authorities in London and pressed them on this question of adulteration, but they could not, as his right hon. friend stated last year, take away under a system of local government such responsible duties from the local authorities. As regarded samples of milk taken in London, in 1902 8,411 samples were taken, of which 1,314 were found to be adulterated. In 1903 9,468 samples were taken, of which 1,275 were adulterated. He was not convinced that that was a sure test of the amount of adulteration. Everything depended upon where samples were taken. If they were taken from the best shops in the neighbourhood, probably the percentage of adulteration would be very small; but if they were taken from shops suspected of adulteration the percentage would be very high. It did not prove that there was more general adulteration in one place than in another. The samples taken in London were not really out of all proportion to the rest of the country. In the model borough of Devonport, for instance, with a population of 70,000, fifty-five samples of milk were taken. In Chelsea, with a population of 73,000, ninety-four samples were taken. In Hackney, with a population three times that of Devonport, twelve times as many samples were taken, and in the City of London, with a regular population of only 26,983, 605 samples were taken. These figures did not show any neglect of duty on the part of the London boroughs.

MR. KEARLEY said the whole matter could be settled by an Order in Council.

MR. GRANT LAWSON said that could only be done by taking each article of food separately and making an Order with regard to it, which would be a very cumbrous method. He could assure the hon. Gentleman that if his words of last year had not apparently borne fruit the Department had done their best to carry out his desires, but, after all, the Board of Agriculture was the most suitable authority to deal with butter and milk, and they were, as a matter of fact, making efforts to insure purity in those articles.

MR. KEARLEY said he was not surprised that the Local Government Board had endeavoured to place the burden of responsibility upon the shoulders of the Board of Agriculture. At the time of the passing of the Act every effort had been made by himself and others to relieve the Local Government Board of all responsibility in the matter, but they insisted upon coming in, and now, when pressed to prevent adulteration, they shelved the responsibility. No answer had been given by the hon. Gentleman to the figures which he had brought to his notice, and he should press the matter to a division, because it was one which he believed would have the assent of the whole Committee.

MR. ALFRED DAVIES (Carmarthen Boroughs) called attention to the liability of rating officers to give particulars of the rates they levied. He had himself received a demand note from the Buckinghamshire County Council for a rate, and at once wrote to that authority for particulars of the rate demanded. He received a reply from the official of the Buckinghamshire County Council, stating that he had no authority to analyse a rate struck for county purposes. He then called attention to the question in this House, and put a Question to the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board, as to whether the Buckinghamshire County Council could not be compelled to give particulars. The right hon. Gentleman answered, evidently in error, that he (Mr. Davies) should communicate with the Buckinghamshire County Council on the subject. That, of course, he had already done. It was most important that general details should be given to ratepayers, if required, of the rate demanded, otherwise they could not criticise the expenditure, and what he now asked was whether the right hon. Gentleman had not full authority to compel the Buckinghamshire County Council to disclose these particulars, and, if he had not, would he say what power there was, if any, to compel them to give them? All he really desired was a proper answer to the Question he had put previously on this subject. There was another question on which he desired some information. He had for years taken a great interest in the importation of frozen and chilled meat. He had no objection to its being eaten if it was not injurious. But some time ago he asked the right hon. Gentleman for information as to whether the decomposition in meat from abroad was injurious to health, and the reply he got was that it was a subject for inquiry. In answer to a further Question, whether it was causing an increasing number of cases of cancer, the right hon. Gentleman stated that he would make inquiries of the Cancer Research Committee. Nothing, however, had since been done, although the matter was of vital importance. No one knew that this meat was injurious to health, but, on the other hand, no one knew whether it was beneficial, and he held that that was a point upon which the country was entitled to information. The President of the Local Government Board had at his command analysts and other officials who could soon settle the question, and he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would take the matter into his consideration with a view to supplying the fullest information possible.

*MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty) expressed his dissatisfaction with the reply given to the hon. Member for Devonport with regard to the adulteration of food. Whether it was milk, whisky, beer, or anything else, the people were entitled to have it pure and unadulterated. It was not expected that the Department would take up all articles of food at once, but why did they not start with one of the most used articles of food, milk? In two districts recently, viz., Finchley and Woking, 500 persons had been affected through contaminated milk, The Local Government Board ought really to take steps, through their experts, to deal with the matter instead of leaving it to the Board of Agriculture. No legislation was required; by an Order in Council the whole business could be settled at once. The right hon. Gentleman had spoken as though it depended upon the kind of shop in which the milk was sold, implying that it was only in little back streets that the adulterated article was sold; but only the other day two large firms were summoned for selling adulterated milk, though they had a guarantee from the farmer. It was time the Board gave up making such miserable excuses. If only Government Departments would give adequate replies to Questions, an enormous saving of public time would be effected, as it would not then be necessary to be constantly raising points in Committee of Supply. He recently asked a Question with regard to the issue of vaccination certificates at Brighton on which the local vaccination officer had had printed a number of notices to parents, and the right hon. Gentleman replied that there was nothing in the certificate to which he could take objection, and that it could be issued as a Government document. Who had to pay for the printing of all these additional notices? Why, the ratepayers! Had not the Local Government Board a staff competent to draw up a circular which would answer all purposes? If not, the sooner they made room for efficient men the better. Notices issued by Government Departments ought to be complete in themselves, and local vaccination officers should be prohibited from adding thereto their own fads.

A further matter about which he had to complain affected another official under the Board. A bacteriologist, in receipt of a salary of £600 a year, was permitted to carry on business on his own account, to use the calves, the laboratory, and the vaccine station belonging to the Government, and to sell lymph for his own profit. So unsound a system ought not to be permitted to continue for a single week. No commercial firm would tolerate this for five minutes. The Government Departments ought to be pure and free from all that sort of thing. If the gentleman to whom he referred was worth more money, let him have it, but do not let this system of jobbery go on. The system was thoroughly unsound, and he asked the right hon. Gentleman to put a stop to it. He wished to know whether there were others in the department who were doing a little on their own account. In regard to the question of calf lymph, he asked the right hon. Gentleman to arrange that there should be a standard of purity, or rather of quality and strength. At the present time there was no standard, and medical men did not know where they were. There were Local Government Board bacteriologists who would be better employed in endeavouring to set up such a standard than in doing a little business on their own account and feathering their nests in the fashion he had described. The Government should be able to furnish every medical man in the country with a supply of lymph if he paid for it. According to a statement published in *The Lancet* in June last, there were something like 16 firms in the metroplis who sold vaccine lymph. It was rather rough on medical men that they should have to go to these private vaccine establishments instead of being able to go to the Local Government Board for their supplies. Vaccination being compulsory it was only right that the Government should make provision for furnishing pure lymph to medical men so that they would not require to go dancing all over the face of the earth for supplies. There was nothing at present to prevent anyone supplying calf lymph. The Local Government Board ought to stop this practice, because an enormous amount of disease arose from vaccination. He asked an explanation of Item P with respect to certain expenditure in the national vaccine establishment. There was a footnote on the same page which stated that £105 had been received from the Local Government Board in Scotland for vaccine supplied to that Department, and that part of this money was paid to the bacteriologist. We should know how much was paid to him. What an extraordinary method of conducting the affairs of this department! The right hon. Gentleman ought to know the details of expenditure in his department. All that hon. Members asked was that the President of the Local Government Board should see that the business of his Department was not conducted on loose and unsound principles such as no employer of labour would tolerate. He begged to move the reduction of the Vote on Item A by £200.

*The CHAIRMAN: I draw the hon. Member's attention to the fact that if he does so he will preclude any answer being given to the various questions put to the Minister in charge of the Vote.

*Mr. WEIR: In that case I beg to move a reduction of £200 on the whole Vote.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum not exceeding £141,889 be granted for the said Service."—(*Mr. Weir.*)

Mr. WALTER LONG said that, in answer to the somewhat vague statements of the hon. Member for Ross and Cromarty, he wished to say that Dr. Blaxall was one of the best public servants employed by the Department. No action of Dr. Blaxall had ever been previously challenged, and the arrangement to which the hon. Gentleman had called attention was arrived at between the Scottish Office and Dr. Blaxall with the full consent of the Treasury. It was not fair to accuse Dr. Blaxall of feathering his own nest and making money at the public expense. There was not the faintest foundation for any one of these vague charges. It was suggested that there should be a standard purity of lymph. In the first place, he doubted whether there was any necessity for it; in the second place, it would be difficult for any Government Department to undertake the supply of lymph to the whole country; and, in the third place, there was no reason to doubt that, from scientific inquiry which had been made, the commercial lymph was not of admirable and excellent quality in every respect. The hon. Member for Carmarthen Boroughs asked if it was within the power of the Local Government Board to prescribe the form of the demand note for rates. The Local Government Board had no power to compel the local authorities to state the different objects of their expenditure or to compel them to break up the rates so as to show the different purposes on which they were to be spent.

*MR. WEIR said that the right hon. Gentleman had referred to one matter and one matter only, although he had mentioned several. The question of pure unadulterated milk was a matter of vital importance; but the right hon. Gentleman treated it with contempt. The right hon. Gentleman smiled. Another matter he brought under the attention of the right hon. Gentleman was the question of vaccination officers expressing in print their own fads on the back of Government Vaccination Certificates, the right hon. Gentleman treated that also with absolute indifference. Then the right hon. Gentleman stated that he had made vague charges against Dr. Blaxall. He had done nothing of the kind. He condemned the system which allowed an officer of a great Government Department to carry on business on his own account. It did not satisfy him to be told that the Treasury approved of it. He, for one, did not approve of it. The officials of the Treasury were not infallible and made mistakes; he thought they did a very wrong thing when they allowed this gentleman to carry on business on his own account. The right hon. Gentleman referred to a standard of purity for lymph. He, however, mentioned quality and strength as well as purity; but the right hon. Gentleman avoided quality and strength. Then the right hon. Gentleman went on to refer to those who prompted him. He wished to tell the right hon. Gentleman that he was not prompted by anyone. He acted on his own account; he studied the questions he brought before the House for himself, and did not take his information second-hand. He did not think, therefore, it was fair on the part of the right hon. Gentleman to state that he was prompted. As the reply of the right hon. Gentleman was so unsatisfactory, and as vital questions were ignored, he could not see his way to withdraw his Amendment.

The Committee proceeded to a Division, and the Chairman stated that he thought the Noes had it; and, on his decision being challenged, it appeared to him that the Division was vexatiously claimed, and he accordingly called upon the Members who supported and who challenged his decision successively to rise in their places, and he declared the Noes had it, Fifteen Members only who challenged his decision having stood up.

Original Question again proposed.

And, it being after half-past Seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

THAMES RIVER STEAMBOAT SERVICE BILL (BY ORDER).

Order for Consideration, as amended, read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill, as amended, be now considered."

*MR. ERNEST GRAY (West Ham, N.) said he rose to move that this Bill be considered this day six months. Up to the previous evening a similar Motion to that which he now proposed, and having the same object in view, stood upon the Paper in the name of one of the representatives of the Admiralty and he now invited the attention of the House while he addressed himself to the circumstances which led to the placing by the Admiralty authorities of the notice on the Paper and to its subsequent withdrawal. It was frequently pleaded that when a Bill had been considered by a Committee the House of Commons must demand very good reason indeed for interfering with such decision. That was a general rule in which he acquiesced, but in this case the decision given by the Committee had not precluded the Admiralty from placing a notice of Motion on the Paper which, had it been persisted in, would have upset the decision arrived at by the Committee and brought about the rejection of this Bill. The promoters of this Bill when they found themselves opposed by this powerful public Department had postponed the Bill from time to time while they negotiated with the Admiralty with whom they had now come to terms. His submission was that it was most unfair that a municipal body should be allowed to come to terms in this way with a great State Department, and that when private interests were concerned they should be utterly callous and ignore them. A State Department and a private individual having property at stake should be treated in a similar manner, and it was not fair when the opposition was strong for a great municipal body to negotiate with their opponent and when the opposition was that of a private individual to ignore it and try and beat it down.

The Bill before the House proposed to establish a new service of steamboats on the Thames to run from the western to the eastern boundaries of the administrative county, beyond which it was not proposed to go. It was proposed to invest a capital sum of £280,000 for the purpose of carrying out this scheme, but there was nothing in the Bill which restricted the London County Council to that capital expenditure. This project had been before the House on three separate occasions. It was rejected by a Committee of this House in 1902, and a similar Bill was also thrown out in 1903, but on this occasion the Bill had been passed by the Committee. The £280,000 proposed capital was no doubt proposed to be raised on the credit of London, and he asked the House to seriously consider the high indebtedness with which the London County Council was burdening the ratepayers. It was proposed to add this huge item to outstanding capital account, yet the London County Council could not even claim that this service would then be self-supporting. Their own witnesses before the Committee admitted that the concern could not be made a profitable one for at least six years, while for the first three there must be a continual annual loss, so that year after year the ratepayers of London were to be called upon to make good the administrative faults of the London County Council,—tramways, first one venture and then another, always with an illusory prospect of profit in the future which was never realised. If the evidence given before the Committee on behalf of the promoters meant anything at all it meant that the House of Commons was being asked to sanction a proposal embracing a large capital expenditure which was to extend over twenty years, although the project was not likely to have so long a life; and in addition to that expenditure the ratepayers of London were to pay the annual loss. This was an instance of municipal trading of the very worst kind. He doubted the need for this action on the part of the London County Council. He doubted whether this service was ever likely to be of any value to the real workers of London or whether any steamboat service which had existed upon the river had ever met the needs of the working classes. No working man wanting to move quickly from Battersea to Westminster would look to a Thames steamboat as a means of quick transit. If any service was to be a success it must be one analagous to that upon the river Seine composed of very small boats running in very quick succession, but that was not the service proposed under this Bill. If he saw the least chance of this Bill conferring any benefit on persons desiring to reach their work quickly he should be prepared to accept it and swallow a large number of the objectionable principles which it contained, but, knowing the river as he did and the class of people who filled the boats, he did not see the least chance of that being the case. The majority of the people who filled these boats were the bank holiday folk and the Sunday afternoon folk, the working man was seldom seen upon them, they taking the opportunity of using a more rapid means of getting from east to west.

This scheme of municipal trading needed the most careful scrutiny. It was open to many and serious objections. Quite apart from the fact that it would place upon the London ratepayers an annual charge for an indefinite period, he failed to understand how anybody could stand up and advocate that this boon should be conferred on one section of the community at the cost of another. No benefit could be conferred on the dwellers in the extreme north and south of London by a system of cheap transit on the river, and therefore they should not be called upon to pay for it. He ventured to say that when municipal bodies embarked in trading of this character, they should be bound by the conditions which bound every private individual, that was to say, they should make such undertakings self-supporting. There were many other objections; for instance, there was the strong objection of the borough which he had the honour to represent. He had earlier in the day presented a petition signed by over 7,000 citizens of West Ham praying that the House should not pass this Bill in the present form as it would inflict upon them a permanent injury of a very serious character. The names in that petition were collected within the last five days, and had further time been devoted to their collection the petition would have contained from 50,000 to 80,000 names of persons all honestly opposed to the Bill in its present form. It was obvious in the face of the London County Council proposals that no private company could compete with this authority in this service. The London County Council proposed to start a service of steamers, build piers, charge pier dues and tolls, and the London County Council alone would be the authority running steamers up and down the river. It would be suggested that the Bill contained nothing which could prevent a private company running its own steamers, but with all the piers under the control of the London County Council such a thing was quite impossible, and to suggest it was most unfair. It was manifestly impossible for any company or individual to compete with the London County Council, because with the piers under the control of the County Council, with the tolls and dues upon them, it was impossible to make a private concern pay.

This Bill created the largest and most serious monopoly that London had yet seen. This Bill asked the House to create a monopoly all along the river, but it did not propose to deal fairly with the interests which it disturbed, or compensate those whose interest it destroyed. In the case of West Ham there was a population of nearly 300,000 people, with two miles of frontage on the river. This service proposed to stop some distance from the boundaries of West Ham. It was opposed to a scheme promoted by a private company which was prepared to supply West Ham with a service, yet that locality was unable to extract from the London County Council any sort of pledge that they would give them any service whatever. It was distinctly unfair, if they could not give a service at all, not to allow an open field to those who were prepared to do so. He would, no doubt, be told that the London County Council was very generous, that they had constantly given West Ham grants. It was true that they had given West Ham grants to buy parks and open spaces, but West Ham was daily giving London grants. West Ham was the dormitory of London. The men who made the wealth of London came to West Ham to sleep, their children were the care of the locality. West Ham did not ask for charity but for justice. Inasmuch as these men were engaged in London from early morning till late at night, they said they ought not to be shut off from access to the river, and that if the London County Council sought to establish a monopoly, it should at least extend its service to the whole of the riparian portions of this urban borough. The southern portion of this borough was intersected with water-ways, owing to the Albert and Victoria Docks. To allow the coming in of big ships from the river the swing bridges were so often moved, that for hours during the day the place was a complete island, shut off from rail and road communication, and the people of this part of West Ham were naturally very anxious to secure the benefit of a river service. As it had been impossible to extract from the promoters of this Bill a pledge such as had been given by the promoters of the other Bill which was rejected by the Committee, he had to come to this House and ask it to take these circumstances into consideration and not to allow a monopoly of this kind to do West Ham this injustice.

On the Thames, ten years ago, was a fleet of steamers owned by the Victoria Steamboat Company; the company got into difficulties, and as a result of an investigation into their affairs by the London County Council, it was suggested that the approaches to the piers should be improved and private enterprise should be encouraged. The County Council subsequently went farther, and Sir J. McDougall, the Chairman of the London

County Council, and the chairman of the committee which carried out the investigations, approached Mr. Hills, a well-known shipbuilder, and encouraged him to embark in this enterprise. There was but little difference between the statement of Mr. Hills and that of Sir J. McDougall, and certainly the Rivers Committee passed a resolution which would be construed by any ordinary man as a direct encouragement to private enterprise to take up this work. Pressure was brought to bear on the chairman of the committee, and the report which had been prepared by the committee, but not submitted to the Council, was withdrawn. The report itself had been published in *The Times*, but the fact that it had not been approved by the Council was not made public. Thus Mr. Hills was egged on to proceed with the enterprise, and, after he had spent £150,000 on boats and piers, the County Council, as another election was approaching, thought it would be a grand advertisement if they decided to run a service of boats themselves. That was manifestly unfair. Mr. Hills had been misled, he would not say deliberately, and what had been the result? That gentleman kept on the service for five years; 15,000,000 passengers were carried without a single accident to life or limb; the service was a safe, quick, and popular service, and it would have been pecuniarily successful but for the fact that Mr. Hills, being a strong teetotaler, refused to allow refreshments to be sold in the cabins, and thus lost a considerable revenue. The service was as good a one as could be obtained under the present conditions of the river, but the County Council now came along, claimed to crush their competitor out of existence, and calmly told him to do the best he could with the stock they had induced him to purchase or construct. The Admiralty had under their care one single pier at Greenwich Hospital, and the County Council had to bargain with them for it; but Mr. Hills, who had purchased eight piers, being a private individual and not a Government Department, was left in the lurch. The Committee by which the Bill was considered said that they took note of the fact that the London County Council were prepared to deal fairly with the property of Mr. Hills, but the Council through their counsel immediately denied that they had given any pledge, and refused to agree to purchase even under what were known as the "old iron" clauses. It was unjust as between a great municipality and one of their prominent citizens who, in a time of stress and at their invitation, had undertaken this enterprise that the County Council should now attempt to ride rough-shod over Mr. Hills, and he appealed to the House of Commons not to allow so great an injustice to pass unnoticed. This was an attempt on the part of an ambitious municipality, who were prepared to be the makers and sellers of everything in London, to crush out anybody who attempted to compete with them, and if Parliament were prepared to make them the greatest monopolists this country had yet seen they ought at least to insist on fair treatment being meted out to those who were being hustled out of the field. He was anxious to see the riverway restored to its proper position, but he believed it could be done by private enterprise, and until it was proved that private enterprise could not maintain a service of boats on the river Parliament ought not to create this municipal monopoly, or, if they did, they ought to see that even-handed injustice was meted out to all concerned, whether State Department, local authority or private individual. He appealed to the House not to allow it to be said that inside Parliament might was right, and that right might cry for help in vain. He begged to move.

SIR FREDERICK BANBURY (Camberwell, Peckham), in seconding the Amendment, said that experience had shown that a steamboat service on the Thames could not be made pecuniarily successful, and he failed to see why the ratepayers of London should be put to the expense of maintaining a service which would benefit only a small proportion of the inhabitants. The past history of the question was this, the Citizen Company became bankrupt, and were taken over by the Victoria Company; they in turn lost a great deal of money, and were bought out by Mr. Hills; Mr. Hills, being an exceedingly rich man, did not become bankrupt, but he found the chances of making a profit so remote that two years ago he abandoned the service. These three attempts by private enterprise having failed, he was unable to see, looking at the matter from a commercial point of view, what chance there was of the County Council succeeding. The contemplated capital expenditure was £280,000, an annual expenditure of £98,000 was estimated, and the County Council did not pretend there would be a sufficient return to cover it. In the evidence given before the Committee the Council stated they would at first pay the same wages as were paid by Mr. Hills, but it was to be expected that as soon as the service was municipalised there would be an increase of wages and a reduction of fares, so that it would be impossible for the service to be remunerative. If they once admitted the principle that municipalities were to come forward as philanthropists and carry out schemes which were for the advantage, or the supposed advantage, of the few, and that the expense or profit was not to be considered, they would be embarking upon a policy the final results of which no man could foresee. Unless it could be proved that this service would be an advantage to the great majority of the inhabitants of London, the County Council had no right to place any charge on the ratepayers in respect of it. The only people who would derive any advantage would be those who lived upon the river and who desired to go to some other locality also on the river. The inhabitants of Fulham, Chelsea, and Greenwich would doubtless be benefited, but he objected to his constituents who were not on the river and who would therefore gain no advantage having to pay for privileges enjoyed only by a small minority. In the days when the Thames was a great highway, there were no underground railways, tramways, or good roads, but matters were now very different. He was prepared to vote with his hon. friend, but he was not quite clear as to the proposal to give compensation to Mr. Hills. Mr. Hills went into a trading concern and he lost his money, but he did not see that that had anything to do with the County Council. This Bill had been before three Committees within the last three years. Two of those Committees had rejected it, while one Committee had passed it only by the casting vote of the Chairman.

Mr. CHARLES ALLEN (Gloucestershire, Stroud): It was rejected last year only by the casting vote of the Chairman.

Sir FREDERICK BANBURY said that in that case the one balanced the other, and the third ought to be taken as conclusive. He hoped the House would not allow the Bill to pass on this occasion.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day six months.'"—(*Mr. Ernest Gray.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

***Sir JOSEPH LEESE** (Lancashire, Accrington) said that seeing that he occupied the position of Chairman of the Committee whose decision was now being called into question he would naturally be expected to intervene in this debate. He had listened with some interest to the speech of the hon. Member for West Ham, which he thought would have done infinite credit to the counsel for West Ham before any Committee, and personally he should have been very glad if the hon. Member had given evidence as a witness before the Committee which passed this Bill. He thought the hon. Member's speech was rather one of generalities, and he appeared to have avoided the real issue. They had before the Committee a clear issue. Two Bills were brought before them, one asking for Parliamentary powers for the London County Council to run steamboats on the Thames, and the other was a competitive Bill run by Mr. Arnold Hills who claimed that the County Council should purchase his boats, piers, and plant, and alternatively that they should enter into a partnership with him, the County Council finding a sum of £60,000 or £70,000, the only *quid pro quo* for which was to be the appointment of two of their number as directors of the joint board. On that issue the Committee, after twelve days hard work, came to an unanimous decision in favour of the County Council.

MR. GALLOWAY (Manchester, S. W.): It was not unanimous.

***SIR JOSEPH LEESE**: The courtesy of the hon. Member for Manchester is so well known that I will not give way to him.

MR. GALLOWAY: I beg pardon.

***SIR JOSEPH LEESE** said he would repeat his statement that it was an unanimous decision. The Committee over which he presided, after hearing all the evidence of the witnesses, decided to reject Mr. Hill's Bill and accept the preamble of the London County Council's Bill. In doing so the Committee rejected the proposal that there should be a partnership with the County Council, and they also rejected the suggestion that the County Council should be called upon to purchase Mr. Hill's boats, piers, and plant. And after this the hon. Member for West Ham put down a proposal to the effect that—

> "The Council shall before exercising any of the powers of this Act, purchase such of the piers and such of the steamboats of the Thames Steamboat Company (1897), Limited, for such price and upon such terms and conditions as, failing agreement, shall be determined by an arbitrator to be appointed by the Board of Trade."

That point was argued and witnesses were examined upon it, and the Committee determined that the case would not hold water. He submitted that this proposal contained in the clause put down on the Paper by the hon. Member for West Ham was directly subversive of the decision of the Committee.

SIR FREDERICK BANBURY, on a point of order, asked whether it was competent for the hon. Member to discuss a clause which was not before the House. The question before the House was the rejection of the Bill.

***MR. SPEAKER** said that the hon. Member for West Ham had devoted a large part of his speech to the proposals contained in his clause.

***SIR JOSEPH LEESE** said he was sorry to see that the good manners of the hon. Member for Manchester were extending. [Cheers and MINISTERIAL cries of "Oh."]

MR. GALLOWAY asked whether the hon. Member was in order in making a suggestion that he was discourteous to him when he had no such intention, and had, indeed, offered him an apology across the floor of the House.

***SIR JOSEPH LEESE** said the courtesy of the hon. Gentleman showed itself by giving him a very direct contradiction on a matter on which he could not be well-informed.

MR. GALLOWAY: The hon. Gentleman entirely misunderstood me. I did not contradict him.

***MR. SPEAKER**: I hope this controversy will now close.

***SIR JOSEPH LEESE**, after remarking that he apologised if he had said anything offensive to the hon. Member opposite, said the Committee decided to give the County Council a free hand. Mr. Hills possessed thirty-six steamboats, and their age averaged twenty-four years each. It was true that three of them were built in the year 1898. When Sir William White, who was one of Mr. Hills' own witnesses, offered his evidence, he, as Chairman, asked him what was the average life of a Thames steamboat, and Sir William replied, "twenty-five years." This clause, which had been put down by the hon. Member for West Ham, would place upon the London County Council an obligation to purchase Mr. Hills' boats, most of which were, on that gentleman's own admission, within a year of the term of their natural existence. They also refused to tie the County Council's hands with regard to the eight piers owned by Mr. Hills, because it was put before the Committee that the tramways and the steamboats were to be made part of one general scheme of transit, that through tickets available by both trams and steamboats would be issued, and that in the interest of the public it might be necessary to put piers in places where they did not exist at present. On that ground they refused to tie the hands of the London County Council. There was an Amendment on the Paper with regard to West Ham. But West Ham was outside the jurisdiction of the London County Council, and made no contribution to the rates. The Committee had very carefully considered the matters involved in the Bill, and he hoped the House would not set aside their decision. The hon. Member had made reference to what had been said by him as Chairman in announcing the decision of the Committee. He read the shorthand report of his remarks on that occasion, and from that report it was clear that he had very expressly guarded against the introduction of any clause such as that which had been put on the Paper. Therefore he hoped that the House of Commons would not accept this Motion but pass the Bill.

*SIR ALEXANDER BROWN (Shropshire, Wellington) said the Committee over which he presided heard the case thoroughly, and after careful consideration threw out this Bill upon its merits. The County Council now came forward with precisely the same proposals and asked the House of Commons to pass the Bill which the Committee over which he presided had previously rejected. He did not wish to go into detail, but he would give briefly the reason why the Committee thought this Bill should not pass. The Thames, it was contended, was a great waterway which the Bill proposed to use in order to convey working men to and from their work. It was found, however, that working men going to and returning from work could be carried more quickly and cheaply by tram and railway. The river service could only become a great service for pleasure purposes in the summer months, and he and his colleagues agreed that the charge for such a service should not be laid on London as a whole. The tidal character of the Thames and its windings were serious obstacles to a successful service. The House would be well advised not to allow this charge to be imposed on the ratepayers of London.

MR. JOHN BURNS (Battersea) said the Amendment moved by the hon. Member for West Ham practically opened up a number of issues which would have been more appropriately discussed on the Second Reading of the previous Bill. In raising those issues the hon Member made certain statements, one of which evoked some sympathy, which he was afraid was given under a misapprehension. The hon. Member said in moving the rejection of this Bill that he had put down a similar Motion to that which was put down by a representative of the Government on behalf of the Admiralty. That was hardly the case. The Admiralty were the trustees for the widows and orphans chargeable upon the revenues of the Greenwich pier, and consequently they had a right to defend the interests of those dependent upon them. The hon. Member opposite, however, did not inform the House that the Greenwich pier was the only pier along the Thames which the County Council sought to acquire compulsorily, and he thought that was sufficient to dispose of the misinterpretation which the hon. Member for West Ham built upon that mistake. The City Corporation did not oppose the Bill, and the Thames Conservancy and the County Council had agreed to clauses. The Admiralty had been satisfied, and all the borough councils with one exception supported the Bill. The House had been asked to reject this Bill for some of the most remarkable reasons which had ever been advanced. There was one person opposed to this Bill and that was Mr. Arnold Hills, who was a large creditor of the defunct steamboat company and the present owner of the derelict company which had not run a boat for three years upon the river. Mr. Hills lived in the constituency of the hon. Member for West Ham, and it did not surprise him that that gentleman, out of 5,000 or 6,000 men he employed, with their uncles, cousins, and their aunts, had managed to get 7,000 signatures to a petition against this Bill. He thought that would dispose of the petition. The hon. Member for West Ham objected for other reasons, and he asked the House to "look at the indebtedness of London." He wished to point out, however, that the object of the hon. Member's proposal was to increase the indebtedness of London and to relieve West Ham of its responsibility in this matter. In this connection he would ask the hon. Member to remember his little jaunt down the Thames that afternoon.

*MR. ERNEST GRAY: Allow me to inform the hon. Member that I have been in the House all this afternoon.

MR. JOHN BURNS said that he was glad that the hon. Member had not taken part in a vulgar and impudent attempt to influence hon. Members by asking them to lunch and giving them a trip on the river, and parading some half-dozen of these steamboats, with an extra coat of paint, up and down in front of the Terrace. The London County Council were not unsympathetic towards West Ham, but they had no right to spend the money of the ratepayers of London upon questions external to the London ratepayers' jurisdiction. The London County Council had brought in a Bill to have a steamboat service from Hammersmith on the west to Greenwich on the east, to which the ratepayers of the County of London were asked to contribute. In regard to this proposal, West Ham had asked to have a look in, but the answer of the County Council was that in this Bill they could not sanction such a proposal, which ought to come before the Examiners in order that everyone interested could be heard, and therefore they were unable to comply with the request made by the hon. Member for West Ham. If this service turned out successful and Parliament was willing to allow them to help West Ham, then they would not object, but they must do things decently and in order, and they had no right to spend the money of London ratepayers upon a provincial community's interests. If they did this in regard to West Ham, why not do it also in regard to Windsor and Tilbury? Wherever the County Council could help West Ham in reference to parks, drainage, the across-river ferry, or in other ways, they had always done so as much as they possibly could.

The hon. Member for West Ham had stated that the County Council had lured Mr. Arnold Hills on to promote this service, but it was not so; Mr. Hills knew his business as well as anybody, and he would remind the House that in 1893 and 1894, four years before Mr. Hills came upon the scene, proposals were made in election addresses for a municipal steamboat service on the Thames. The steamboat service on the Thames for a long time had been irregular and slow; it started late and stopped too soon; the boats were dirty and obsolete; and they were urged to establish an efficient steamboat service on the Thames long before Mr. Hills appeared on the scene. When the hon. Member for West Ham talked about the value of these steamboats, he would remind him that only some four out of thirty-six were considered to be at all decent instruments of transit, The *Daily Chronicle* described them as "penny strugglers," and the *Financier and Bullionist* stated that no one would buy them at any price. The *Sunday Sun* declared that this was the very worst steamboat service in Europe. As *The Times* had said, they were "neither fast nor commodious," they were "old, dirty, and worn out," and afforded no shade in summer or shelter in winter. The cabins were dark and stuffy and the means for landing passengers were inadequate. In fact, the only way to improve the service was "to scrap existing passenger vessels." After that he should subscribe to *The Times* for the rest of his Parliamentary life. Another witness called by Mr. Arnold Hills this year declared that he should prefer to keep the three new boats of the fleet and have a new lot beside them, with one or two exceptions. The principal witness called by Mr. Hills, Sir William White, stated that no boat ought to be expected to last more than twenty-five years, and the average age of Mr. Hills' fleet was beyond that period.

They had been accused of ill-treating Mr. Hills in this matter, but he would remind the House that Mr. Hills frequently carried out large contracts for the London County Council and they had no fault to find with his work. Therefore they had no prejudice against him, and they had such a good case that magnanimity took the place of prejudice, and they pitied Mr. Hills. The House should remember that Mr. Hills said that he would not sell his boats and that he would not be ignored, and he also asserted that if the London County Council went to Parliament he would oppose them. Mr. Hills wanted joint municipal and private enterprise, but the County Council were not willing to adopt that course upon the terms suggested. He denied that they had lured Mr. Hills on, and therefore the accusation of the hon. Member for West Ham fell to the ground. He wished to point out that in this matter they were not treating Mr. Hills differently than the House of Commons treated gas and water and railway companies. When a municipality in an Act of Parliament expropriated either a gas, water, electric lighting, or railway concern, it was compelled by Parliament to pay to the people expropriated the proper price of their undertakings, as a going concern, and their business was handed over to the community. In these cases, however, those companies had statutory rights and monopolies conferred upon them by Parliament, and so they had a legal right to be fairly and reasonably, and, in some cases, generously, compensated. Mr. Hills was not in that position, for he had no exclusive privilege to run steamboats on the Thames. There were three other steamboat companies on the Thames besides Mr. Hills' company, and, therefore, he had no statutory or monopoly claim, and his service was not a going concern. Mr. Hills' service had been derelict for three years, and it was bankrupt before he foolishly took it over. Mr. Hills would not sell, but he asked that in this Bill there should be inserted a clause which would treat him as if he had a statutory monopoly right. The London County Council said that out of regard for the interests of the ratepayers of London they could not consent to such an unfair and monstrous proposition, and he was glad that upon this point they had the strong financial support of the hon. Baronet the Member for Peckham, who knew more about finance, especially in regard to steamboats, than he could claim to know. He asked the House not to place such a charge upon them, because if the clause of the hon. Member for West Ham was carried the County Council would not proceed any further with the Bill, for they had already decided to treat Mr. Hills as fairly as he deserved to be treated. In the event of Mr. Hills having any piers or steamboats which, in the County Council's judgment, could be adapted and used for the benefit of the new steamboat service, they would be only too pleased to purchase them. He would go further and say that other things being equal the County Council would like to give Mr. Hills a share of the contract for the building of the new boats. If they had a good service they would do their best to help West Ham.

The question was—Can this be made to pay? In the past it had been impossible for private enterprise to make this service pay. Why? Private enterprise had said that the piers should be in the wrong places—namely, between the bridges instead of at the bridges. The County Council, being the bridges authority and the embankment authority, and, in this matter, having the assistance of the City Corporation and the Thames Conservancy Board, who would let them have their piers for nothing, would be able to provide a pier at every bridge and a tramway at every pier, with a system of interchangeable tickets for the tramcars and the boats. They carried 150,000,000 of passengers on the tramcars, and they believed that, even if they had a small loss on the working of the boats during the first two or three years, they would ultimately derive a profit from the boat service. If they treated the boats and the tramways as one service they could make up on the tramways what they lost on the boats. The hon. Member opposite said the County Council had lost on the tramway service. They had only lost during the period of electrification, and in four years they had made £300,000 profit which they had been able to apply for the benefit of the ratepayers. The hon. Member for Peckham knew that they were more likely to gain than to lose, otherwise the 'bus proprietors would not oppose them as they had done. Whether that were so or not let the County Council have its chance. He asked the House with respect and confidence to allow the County Council to make an attempt to provide a steamboat service on the river worthy of London.

Mr. PLATT-HIGGINS (Salford, N.) said the hon. Member for West Ham had stated that if Mr. Hills had been allowed to have his way there would have been an efficient service provided. What did the people of West Ham regard as an efficient service? Was it a service that only ran in the summer time? What good would such a service be to working men who had to go to their work all the year round? The hon. Member for West Ham did not state that if this Bill were thrown out there would only be a summer service. The County Council should be entrusted with this work because they would give a service all the year round. It was not to be expected that they could get an efficient service from a company that needed financial support. From a report by the statistical officer of the London County Council seven years ago it appeared that the Thames Shipbuilding Company made proposals to them somewhat on the same lines as the present. He reminded the House that on a former occasion Mr. Hills put in the model of an electric launch which he considered a desirable type of boat for the river service. He recommended that small electric launches should run frequently. In view of that opinion he thought it would be outrageous if the House were to require the County Council to purchase large boats of insufficient speed. If this Bill were thrown out West Ham would get a steamer service which would be of little or no use. West Ham was not a Sunday outing place or a week-end resort. This was a case in which municipal enterprise would step in and carry on a business which could not be carried on profitably by private enterprise, but was needed in the interests of London.

MR. FITZROY (Northamptonshire, S.) said he did not intend to follow other speakers in going into the details of the evidence given before the Committee. He did not think this House was capable of sifting evidence of that kind, and he should prefer to treat only of the main principle which influenced him in opposing the Bill now before the House. As a member of the Committee that sat upstairs last year on the Bill of a similar character that was brought before the House by the London County Council, he should like to say one or two words with reference to this Bill and to give his reasons for opposing it. He only regretted, and he was sure the House would agree with him in that respect, that the Gentleman who acted as Chairman of the Committee last year had been removed from their midst by death. He deplored that he could not therefore give his views on this subject, which he would have done so much more ably than he (the speaker) could do. This was now the third Bill which had been brought before the House, the two previous ones having been thrown out by Committees upstairs, which had gone carefully and exhaustively into the evidence which was put before them. He would say at the outset that he thought Mr. Hills, the owner of the old steamboat service, was wrong in imagining that Parliament would sanction a Bill giving power for a county council to connect itself with a private individual in undertaking a necessarily speculative proceeding such as this must be, so the only question which really remained was as to whether the County Council should have the power, or rather the monopoly, of running a steamboat service on the Thames, or whether it was to be left to a private individual company to satisfy the public demands in this direction. Most people were of opinion that there should be a service on the Thames, and they were led to believe that unless the County Council established one there would be none. He believed that was an error; indeed it was shown in the evidence that if the London County Council would remove their opposition to Mr. Hills' company, and some better arrangement could be made in regard to freeing the piers from dues, the steamboat service would have been running these last two years and would continue to run.

Before a county council undertook an enterprise such as this with public money there were one or two points which should be definitely established. In the first place it should be clearly established that there was a very general demand for the undertaking by a good majority of the ratepayers. Otherwise public money taken from the pockets of all was being spent for the benefit of a small minority. From the evidence given before the Committee he did not think it was at all clearly shown that there was a general demand for the County Council to undertake the steamboat service, the only demand coming from pleasure seekers who enjoyed a trip on the river, and from one or two boroughs situated high up on the banks of the river. Secondly, if it could not be shown that this would be a very great boon to the great majority of ratepayers, it should at any rate be shown that if it only benefited the minority, it could be undertaken with a reasonable prospect of financial success or at any rate with a very small loss to the ratepayers as a whole. Everything in the evidence pointed in a contrary direction. They had the experience with regard to the river service for a great many years back, and, so far as he knew, hardly any company or private individual had been able to make anything, except a summer service on the river, pay. This Bill of the County Council proposed to run a service all the year round, but, from all the evidence they could collect on the subject, nothing but a service from April to September showed any adequate return for capital laid out, and even that depended on the weather. If, then, they accepted the fact that it was impossible to make an all-the-year-round steamboat service pay, and that it must be maintained by a body to whom profit is a secondary consideration, they might be inclined to ask whether to a county council loss was a secondary consideration also. It was astonishing to hear Gentlemen talk in giving evidence in support of this Bill, that even if it was a loss it would amount to something very small on the rates—a farthing or something of that kind. They seemed to forget that a multiplication of farthings on a variety of different enterprises amounted to pennies and pence to shillings, and so they got the enormous rate under which so many municipalities and local authorities suffered. The London County Council's past history was not an encouraging one to lead one to believe that this enterprise would be any more profitable than their other undertakings. The London County Council laid great stress on the fact that up to now the service had not been efficient. He would point out that the tide, fogs, etc., on this river were of a different character from any other river in the world, and that influences of this kind would affect boats controlled by the County Council equally with any others, and that the fact of the County Council owning this service would be no more a guarantee of a punctual service than if any other company gave the same pledges. Altogether the evidence on this Bill distinctly pointed to the County Council being willing lightheartedly to enter upon this undertaking with the utmost certainty that it would involve them in financial loss, and put a further burden on the ratepayers in London, not for the benefit of the majority but of a small minority.

Mr. CHARLES HOBHOUSE (Bristol, E.) said he was a member of the Thames Conservancy Board, which at present was the only authority existing with respect to matters pertaining to the river. The hon. Member for Shropshire had stated that on two previous occasions a Bill similar to this had been thrown out. He wished to point out that on the two previous occasions the Thames Conservancy had offered strong opposition to it. On this occasion they had come to terms with the County Council. The County Council had given them all that they wanted, and, when it was understood that the Committee had practically accepted the preamble of the Bill, general satisfaction was expressed at a meeting of the Conservators that at last the Thames was to be provided with an all-the-year-round service. All the municipal authorities of London, with the exception of St. Pancras, were in favour of the passing of the Bill, and he ventured to think that fact might well add to the weight of the evidence which had been adduced in support of the measure.

Lord HUGH CECIL (Greenwich) said he would say nothing about the dispute which had occupied a good deal of the time and attention of the House as between Mr. Hills on the one side and the County Council on the other, because he was strongly of opinion that it was not a matter appropriate to be discussed in the whole House, but one appropriate for the consideration of the Committee which had already considered it. If the result arrived at was not satisfactory to Mr. Hills the matter could be considered by a Committee in another place. He felt, and indeed he thought his hon. friend the Member for West Ham would admit, that the opposing of a private Bill on the Third Reading was never a very convenient course. A private Bill ought not to be thrown out on the Third Reading on a mere question of private right—which was properly a matter for a Committee—but on the ground of public policy. Therefore, considering the Bill entirely from the point of view of public policy, he felt bound to support it. The action of the London County Council in undertaking to provide a steamboat service upon the Thames was different from other cases of municipal trading, because here there was no entering into competition with private enterprise, as there was no steamboat service in existence. The riverside people wanted an efficient service. What was proposed by the County Council resembled the ordinary proceedings of a municipal body in affording facilities for the inhabitants in the district under their control. Compare it to the action of a municipal body in substituting wood pavement for stone pavement in a street. That was not an absolute necessity. They could get on without it. But wood pavement added to the amenity and conduced to easy communication in the street. The street was improved and the rateable area on which the cost of the wood pavement was thrown was much larger, and rightly so, because everybody used the street. It was the same with the waterway. The London County Council proposed to make the Thames an effective thoroughfare. He thought the House would be acting most injudiciously if, in opposition to the desire of the ratepayers of London as expressed by the municipal boroughs and the County Council, and the decision of its own Committee, it were to reject the Bill on the Third Reading.

*CAPTAIN JESSEL (St. Pancras, S.) said it had been stated by previous speakers that the London boroughs were in favour of the Bill. There was a danger of this statement misleading the House of Commons, and he wished to point out that the City of London, City of Westminster, and the Borough of Chelsea, the rateable value of which amounted to £11,000,000, or more than a quarter of the rateable value of the Metropolis, had expressed themselves in favour of the Bill only if the financial position was a sound one. He quite agreed that it was very important to London that there should be a proper steamboat service on the River Thames. The Bill under consideration gave a fifteen minutes service which was useless for the purpose of helping the workmen to easily get to their work. To be really efficient, there should be a five-minutes boat service, and he estimated that this would involve a charge upon the rates of three half-pence in the pound. This would be an unfair burden upon London generally, while the benefit would be solely with the riparian constituencies.

MR. CUMMING MACDONA (Southwark, Rotherhithe) said he supported the Bill. The hon. Member who last spoke talked about certain parts of London paying the rate and the riparian owners only deriving the benefit from it; but the river belonged to the whole of London and all its inhabitants enjoyed the advantages of the steamship service. It was discreditable to London that the Thames should be without steamboats for passengers, and such a service would be a relief to street traffic, and a great convenience to all the inhabitants of London.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 156; Noes, 70. (Division List No. 132.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O.
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Blake, Edward
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Bowles, Lt.-Col. H. F. (Middlesex
Brigg, John
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Causton, Richard Knight
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire)
Cawley, Frederick
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. HnJ. A (Worc.
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cremer, William Randal
Crooks, William
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davenport, William Bromley-
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Denny, Colonel
Devlin Charles Ramsay (Galway
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dewar, Sir T. R. (Tower Hamlets
Dickson, Charles Scott
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Emmott, Alfred
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Gardner, Ernest
Goddard, Daniel Ford

Gordon,MajEvans-(T'rH'mlets
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Grant, Corrie
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Edward Marshall
Harris,F. Leverton (Tynem'th)
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Heath,Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heath, James (Staffords. N.W.
Hope, J.F.(Sheffield Brightside
Horniman, Frederick John
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon.Arthur Fred.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Jones,William (Carnarvonshire
Kearley, Hudson E.
Lambert, George
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Leamy, Edmund
Lee,ArthurH.(Hants.,Fareham
Leese,Sir Joseph F.(Accrington
Leng, Sir John
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Lough, Thomas
Lowther,RtHnJ.W.(Cum.Penr
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Maconochie, A. W.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver,Sir Lewis (EdinburghW
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)

Markham, Arthur Basil
Montagu,Hon.J.Scott (Hants.)
Morgan,DavidJ.(Walthamstow
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Norman, Henry
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Malley, William
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Randles, John S.
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Remnant, James Farquharson
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rose, Charles Day
Rothschild, Hon.Lionel Walter
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Chas Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Slack, John Bamford
Soames, Arthur Wellesley

Spear, John Ward
Spencer,RtHn.C.R.(Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Sullivan, Donal
Talbot,Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'd.Univ
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Walrond,Rt.Hn. SirWilliam H.
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason,John Cathcart(Orkney)
Weir, James Galloway
Welby,Lt.-Col.A.C.E (Taunton
Welby,Sir Charles G.E.(Notts.)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Woodhouse,SirJ.T(Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. John Burns and Mr. Charles Hobhouse.

NOES

Acland-Hood,Capt.Sir Alex. F.
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Balcarres, Lord
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beach,Rt.Hn.SirMichael Hicks
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bowles,T. Gibson (King's Lynn
Brassey, Albert
Brown, Sir Alex. H. (Shropsh.)
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dimsdale,Rt.Hon.Sir JosephC.
Dorington,Rt.Hon. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duke, Henry Edward
Dyke,Rt Hon.SirWilliam Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.

Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Forster, Henry William
Foster,Philip S.(Warwick,S.W.
Galloway, William Johnson
Gore,Hn G.R.C.Ormsby-(Salop
Greene,W. Raymond- (Cambs.)
Gretton, John
Hamilton,Marq.of(L'nd'nderry
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hogg, Lindsay
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col.W. (Salop.
Keswick, William
LawsonJohnGrant(Yorks,N.R
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Majendie, James A. H.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)

Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Ratcliff, R. F.
Ridley,Hon.M.W.(Stalybridge)
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Stanley,Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.)
Stroyan, John
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Valentia, Viscount
Webb, Colonel William George
Wilson-Todd, Sir W.H.(Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt.Hn.E.R.(Bath)
Wrightson, Sir Thomas

TELLERS FOR THE NOES, Mr. Ernest Gray and Mr. Fitzroy.

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill, as amended, considered.

A Clause (Purchase of piers and steamboats from the Thames Steamboat Company (1897))—

"The Council shall, before exercising any of the powers of this Act, purchase such of the piers and such of the steamboats of the Thames Steamboat Company (1897), Limited, for such price and upon such terms and conditions as, failing agreement, shall be determined by an arbitrator to be appointed by the Board of Trade, and in such arbitration the price to be paid shall be the value (exclusive of any allowance for past or future profits of the undertaking or any compensation for compulsory sale or other consideration whatsoever) of such steamboats, piers, landing-places, and other property of the Steamboat Company suitable to and heretofore used by them for the purpose of a steamboat service on the Thames."—(*Mr. Ernest Gray.*)

Brought up, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question, "That the Clause be read a second time," put, and negatived.

Bill to be read the third time.

SUPPLY [11TH ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[MR. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

*MR. C. R. SPENCER (Northamptonshire, Mid.) said he was sorry to interfere with the business of Supply, but he wished to call attention to the incident which occurred at the conclusion of the Morning Sitting, in order to ask the Chairman's ruling on the following point. He was in the Aye Lobby, accompanied by twenty-three other Members, twenty-four of them had passed the division clerks, and had had their names ticked off. Suddenly there was a call of there being no division. He confessed that he had hurriedly left the Chamber to go into the Lobby at twenty-eight minutes past seven. He wished to know whether those hon. Members who were called upon to stand up in their places took part in a division, or whether he did. He wished also to know whether his vote would appear in the division lists to-morrow as having taken part in a division, or whether he should be stigmatised as having frivolously and vexatiously claimed one.

*THE CHAIRMAN said the hon. Member asked him whether he would appear as having taken part in a division which did not take place. [Cries of "No" and "Withdraw."] If the hon. Member had been in his place he would have known exactly what occurred, namely, that no division did take place. [Cries of "Why?"] If hon. Members would look at the Rule, they would find it was as follows—

> "Mr. Speaker or the Chairman may, after the lapse of two minutes as indicated by the sand-glass, if in his opinion the division is frivolously or vexatiously claimed, take the vote of the House or Committee by calling upon the Members who support and who challenge his decision successively to rise in their places, and he shall thereupon, as he thinks fit, either declare the determination of the House or Committee or name tellers for a division. And in case there is no division the Speaker or Chairman shall declare to the House or Committee the number of the minority who had challenged his decision, and their names shall be thereupon taken down in the House and printed with the lists of divisions."

The hon. Member was not in his place, he did not rise to challenge the decision, and therefore his name would not appear on the list.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.) said might he ask the Chairman to complete his ruling? What happened to Members who were in the lobby expecting a division? Were there no means open to those Members of recording their opinion upon the Question which was put from the Chair?

*THE CHAIRMAN: I have read the Rule, and it makes no provision for this. This is not the first time the Rule has been put in force, and if hon. Members find themselves in the Lobby instead of being in the House——["Oh"]—I was asked a Question, and I tried to give an answer.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee): May I ask—when you came to the conclusion that a division was challenged frivolously, there was only a small number of Members present at the time—whether you had informed yourself that a considerable body of Members, in accordance with the practice of the House, had gone to the Lobby?

*THE CHAIRMAN: I certainly came to the conclusion that the division was challenged vexatiously. If it had not been so I should not have put the Rule in force.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: There was only a small number of Members in the House.

*THE CHAIRMAN: My decision was based on the general course of the debate and the action taken by the hon. Member who challenged a division and who moved the reduction.

MR. EMMOTT (Oldham): May I ask whether the names of the hon. Members who stood up were taken down, and, if so may I ask that my name should be added to them, because I was in the Lobby and passed the teller?

*The CHAIRMAN: I would really ask the hon. Member to look again at the Rules. He cannot ask to have his name put down when he did not rise in his place. The names of the hon. Members who rose in their places were taken down, and will appear to-morrow in due course.

Mr. EMMOTT: May I ask whether we were out of order in going into the Lobby? This is a serious matter. We should not go into the Lobby at all if our votes are not to be counted.

*The CHAIRMAN: I will not undertake to say that the hon. Member is out of order in going into the Lobby. The old Rule of the House was that no Member could vote until he heard the Question put from the Chair, but for the general convenience of Members that was found impossible.

Mr. EMMOTT: May I make an appeal to the Prime Minister?

*The CHAIRMAN: Order, order! I have to administer the Rules of the House. If the hon. Gentleman wishes to alter them he must take the ordinary procedure.

Mr. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid.): Are we to understand that it is our duty to remain in the House until the Question is put a second time?

*The CHAIRMAN: May I point out that this procedure only takes place when a division is vexatiously and frivolously challenged?

Mr. WHITLEY (Halifax): May I ask whether an appeal was made to you that the Members who were in the Lobby should be permitted to come in and stand up in their places and register their votes?

*The CHAIRMAN: The Clerk at the Table has no means of sending out information to Members in the Lobby. The Rule says that Members must rise in their places.

Mr. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs) said that in view of the importance of this question might he ask whether the ruling was that twenty-five Members whose names were taken in the Division Lobby, many of whom challenged the Question on the first occasion, and the fifteen Members who rose in their places on the second occasion were to be considered guilty by the ruling of having challenged the division vexatiously and frivolously.

*The CHAIRMAN: I wish to pass no reflection on the hon. Members who went into the Division Lobby. I do not know what their intention was. The opinion I came to was that the division was vexatiously claimed. It is for me, and not for hon. Members, to give the decision. It is an unfortunate position in which I am placed, but the Rules impose upon me the duty of coming to a determination. I came to that determination in this particular instance. That being so, it only rested with me to put the Rule in force. I have no dispensing power with regard to the Rules. I am as much bound by them as anybody else.

Mr. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): I wish to ask whether there is any precedent for the action which was taken this evening, the Chairman not having been fortified by a previous division that the minority did not amount to forty. I wish to know how you, Sir, made up your mind as to the extent of the opposition. I have in my mind many instances where such action was taken, but it was always taken after repeated divisions which showed that the minority did not amount to forty Members. I ask you, Sir, respectfully, whether there is any precedent for the action you have taken, no division having been held.

*The CHAIRMAN: There is nothing whatever in the Rule with reference to previous divisions, or that the Speaker or Chairman must be guided by previous divisions, in coming to a conclusion as to whether a division is vexatiously or frivolously claimed. I used the best of my judgment, and came to the conclusion I did.

Mr. PATRICK O'BRIEN: Is there any precedent for the action which was taken this evening, a previous division not having been taken?

*THE CHAIRMAN: I have said there is nothing in the Rule with regard to previous divisions; but as the hon. Member asked for a precedent I will give him the precedent of the 22nd April of this year, when the same course was taken without a previous division.

*MR. NORMAN (Wolverhampton, S.): I wish to ask, on a point of order, as arising from your replies, whether it is proper for the division clerks to tick off the names of hon. Members as having taken part in a division when in fact no division was taken?

*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member has been some time in the House; but if he had been as long in the House as I unfortunately have been he would know that the division clerks tick off the names of hon. Members before the Question is put a second time; and that is for the convenience of Members themselves. When a division is "off" nothing happens as regards the names which have been ticked; and hon. Members are no worse off.

*MR. NORMAN: My point is that, as the result of your ruling, a new situation appears to have arisen.

*THE CHAIRMAN: There is no novelty in the situation. The proceeding is perfectly according to the Rule.

MR. KEARLEY (Devonport): On a point of order, Sir, I wish to ask, Can you consider a division to be claimed in a frivolous manner irrespective of numbers?

*THE CHAIRMAN: I can only refer the hon. Member to the Rule. I may say again that I am as much bound by the Rule as the hon. Member himself; and if the hon. Member will kindly look at the Rule which I have read to the House he will see that there is nothing whatever in it about numbers. The Speaker or Chairman has to come to a conclusion as to whether a division is frivolously or vexatiously claimed or not.

MR. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): Is it within the power of the Chairman, even if fifty or a hundred Members challenge a division, to decide that that challenge is vexatious?

*THE CHAIRMAN: The Rule says nothing about numbers. The hon. Member had better wait until such an occasion arises.

MR. MACVEAGH: It has arisen to-night.

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1904-5.

CLASS II.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £146,461, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Office of the Committee of Privy Council for Trade and Subordinate Departments, including a Grant in Aid."

*MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty) said he wished to call attention to the question of light railways in the Highlands of Scotland. The predecessor of the President of the Board of Trade stated that special consideration would be given to the Highlands. He would ask the right hon. Gentleman to use his influence with the Treasury to give effect to that undertaking. There were many districts in the Highlands in which neither dukes nor millionaires were interested, which really required assistance. Light railways would be of enormous advantage to the fishing population; and he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would give the matter his earnest consideration; otherwise all the money which had been spent on surveys and other preliminaries would be lost. There was another matter. This House granted a large sum for the construction of a breakwater at Mallaig in connection with the extension of the railway; he wished to know why the Department had not stirred up the North British Railway Company to complete the work. The breakwater was extremely dangerous; surely it was within the province of the Board of Trade to take action. Twelve months was long enough in which to inquire into the matter; and he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would not allow another twelve months to elapse before taking action. The North British Railway Company did not carry out the work for which they had received a subsidy.

He would urge on the Board of Trade to bring pressure to bear on the railway companies in order to secure a uniform set of by-laws on all the railways throughout the kingdom. It was very confusing to have different by-laws on different lines. He knew railway directors had great influence in this House; but the President of the Board of Trade ought to be head and shoulders over all the railway directors in the country. He appealed to the right hon. Gentleman to take action. Then, as to overcrowding in railway carriages, it was no uncommon thing, especially in lines in the vicinity of London, to see first-class carriages overcrowded with passengers irrespective of what fares they had paid. He had frequently counted as many as eighteen passengers in one compartment. That ought not to be allowed, and the President of the Board of Trade was responsible. He wished to know what action the right hon. Gentleman proposed to take. The right hon. Gentleman said on a previous occasion that the attention of the railway companies would be drawn to it; but what did the railway companies care about overcrowding? They cared only about dividends. This question of overcrowding had been dealt with by the Viceroy of India in connection with Indian railways, and he could not understand why the President of the Board of Trade could not deal with it here. At any rate he would continue to call attention to it until he received some satisfaction. Every year the railway companies were displaying a greater amount of arrogance. If a third-class passenger was found in a first or second-class carriage he was pulled out by the collar. That was an unseemly state of affairs, and ought not to be permitted. He felt some delicacy in attacking the President of the Board of Trade because he had a very small salary; unfortunately he would be out of order in moving that it be increased. The right hon. Gentleman, however, accepted the position and received all the honour and glory attaching to it, and he must take the cuffs and kicks if he did not do his duty. He himself considered the Board of Trade had miserably failed to put a stop to overcrowding. Every year it got worse. As for himself, when railway companies found, as they appeared to be able to find, that he was a Member of this House, they sent him most courteous replies to his communications; but he was shocked at the manner in which the public was treated by the companies. He should like to know what precaution the Board of Trade were taking to prevent a disaster such as happened at Paris a year ago. What precautions were the Board taking to protect people travelling on the tube railways nearly one hundred feet beneath the surface. He trusted before the new lines were opened that the President of the Board of Trade would take care that the carriages were fireproof, and that the public safety would be insured. He, himself, would sooner walk than travel by a tube railway seventy or eighty feet below the surface, where he would have no possible chance of escape in the event of an accident. When he remembered the Paris disaster he thought it was time that they should cry "Halt." The Board of Trade had a large staff of inspectors, and the right hon. Gentleman should see that the safety of of the public was secured.

With reference to the steamers plying to the Western Highlands, he wished to know if they were inspected every year. Some of them were tubs fifty or sixty years old, and they had to traverse the stormy Northern seas exposed in many parts to the Atlantic. Were their boilers and engines examined yearly? This last point referred to the North British Railway Company. Only that morning he had been looking at the casualties on that railway; and he thought that the President of the Board of Trade ought, in the interests of the public, to require the enforcement of the rule forbidding a railway company to employ men for thirteen or fourteen hours a day. The public were exposed to serious danger through the long hours of railway employees.

And, it being Midnight, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon Monday next.

Adjourned at five minutes after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 3rd June, 1904.

The House met at Twelve of the Clock.

MONUMENT TO THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY.

The Comptroller of the Household reported His Majesty's Answer to the Address, as followeth:—

"I have received your Address praying that I will give directions that a Monument be erected in the Collegiate Church of St. Peter, Westminster, to the memory of the late Most hon. the Marquess of Salisbury, with an Inscription expressive of the high sense entertained of his rare and splendid gifts and of his devoted labours in Parliament and in great Offices of State, and assuring Me that you will make good the Expenses attending the same.

"I shall give directions in accordance with your Address."

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz.:—Ticehurst and District Water and Gas Bill [Lords]. Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time.

Carlisle Corporation Bill. Read the third time, and passed.

Lytham Improvement Bill. Read the third time, and passed. [New Title.]

Radcliffe Tramways and Improvement Bill. Read the third time, and passed.

Commons Regulation (Merrow) Provisional Order Bill; Commons Regulation (Oxshott) Provisional Order Bill; Land Drainage Provisional Order (Owston and West Butterwick, in County of Lincoln (Parts of Lindsey) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (Gas) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 12) Bill. Read the third time, and passed.

North British Railway (General Powers) Order Confirmation Bill. Considered, to be read the third time upon Monday next.

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London) Bill [Lords]; Education Board Provisional Order (Swansea) Bill; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill; Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill; Local Government Provisional Order (No. 15) Bill. Read a second time, and committed.

RAILWAY BILLS (GROUP No. 9).

The CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS informed the House that the Committee on Group No. 9 of Railway Bills not being appointed to meet until Tuesday, 7th June, the parties opposing the Tyneside Tramways and Tramroads Bill [Lords] had appeared before him and proved that the evidence of Robert Casson, of Wallsend, Engineer, J. G. Morpeth, of Wallsend, Engineer, and J. McKay, of Walker, Engineer, was essential to their case; and that their attendance could not be procured without the intervention of the House.

Ordered, That Robert Casson, J. G. Morpeth, and J. McKay do attend the Committee on Group No. 9 of Railway Bills on Tuesday next, at half-past Eleven of the clock.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 1) Bill [Lords]. Copy ordered, "of Memorandum stating the nature of the Proposals contained in the Provisional Order included in the Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 1) Bill [Lords]."—(*Mr. Bonar Law.*)

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill. Copy ordered, "of Memorandum stating the nature of the Proposals contained in the Provisional Orders included in the Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill."—(*Mr. Bonar Law.*)

PETITIONS.

COLLEGIATE CHARGES (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Haddington, in favour: to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions for alteration; from Biggar; Haddington; and Duncon and Kilmuir; to lie upon the Table.

LANDS VALUATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Haddington, against; to lie upon the Table.

LAND VALUES TAXATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Haddington, against; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions against; from Kidderminster; Morpeth; Blyth; Bristol (twelve); Newchapel; Chell; Kirtlington; New Southgate; Bedminster (two); Brislington; Chalford; Brown Knowle; Helsby; Sowerby Bridge; Cambois; Sheffield (five); Merthyr; Worthing; Armley (two); Rothwell; Macclesfield; Brighton; Wood Green; Clayton; Moston; Failsworth (two); Midyell; Uyeasound; Burray; Lerwick; Mountain Ash (two); Barton Hill; Hyde; Brixton Hill; Liverpool (four); Pelynt; Harrow; Edinburgh (two); Bridgwater; Leigh; Bannockburn; Oswestry (two); Wetham; Scarborough; Braintree and Bocking; Newcastle-on-Tyne (eight); Timsbury; Kensal Rise; Carluke; Bradworthy; Plymouth; Cilfowys; Gorebridge; Southall (two); Birmingham; Appley Bridge; Glassford; Nethan Vale; Aspull (two); Stenton; Mossley; Norton Backmoor; Coal Aston; Norton Woodseats; Newtown; Deptford and Brockley; Budleigh Salterton; Wibsey; Moseley; Oldham (two); Portmadoc; Leytonstone; Kilkhampton; Woodford Morwenstone; Woolley Morwenstone; Poughill; Feltham; Kilkhampton; Stratton; Hanwell; Morrilow Heath; North Bierley; Bude; Walthamstow (two); Tower Hamlets; Low Moor; Burton-on-Trent; Deddington; Preston Brook; Lostock; Tulse Hill and West Norword; Wigan (two); Watford; Birstall (three); Bourton-on-the-Water; Henley; Gosforth; Fortress; Ardersier; Emley; Coneysthorpe; Sarisbury; Watchet; Newton-on-Ouse; Inverness; Denbigh; Colne; Trawden; West Bromwich (two); Kingston-on-Thames (four); New Seaham; Totterdown; Ronsay; Stane; Maesteg; Glyncorrwg; Middleton on the Wolds; Bridlington Quay (two); Tiverton; Langley Mill; Manchester (two); Cameley; Sutcombe; Ryecroft; Blackley; Willington Quay; and St. Budeaux; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Petition from Worcester, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (SCOTLAND) ACT (1894) AMENDMENT BILL.

Petition from Haddington, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RE-VACCINATION BILL.

Petition from St. Pancras, against; to lie upon the Table.

RE-VACCINATION BILL.

Petition from Bootle, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

TEINDS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Haddington, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

TOWN AND COUNTY COUNCILS (QUALIFICATION OF WOMEN) (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Haddington, against; to lie upon the Table.

VALUATION BILL.

Petition from Merthyr Tydfil, against; to lie upon the Table.

VALUATION BILL.

Petitions for alteration; from City of London; Chipping Sodbury; Ulverston; and Bristol; to lie upon the Table.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION BILL.

Petition from Bristol, against; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

SINKING FUNDS.

Account presented, of the Commissioners for the reduction of the National Debt, showing the amount received and applied in the year ended 31st March, 1904, in respect of the Old and New Sinking Funds [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 192.]

EAST INDIA (FINANCIAL STATEMENT).

Return presented, relative thereto [Address 19th May; *Sir Henry Fowler*] to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 193.]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Vacancies among Female Telegraphists in Ireland.

MR. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he can state how many vacancies occurred amongst female telegraphists in the different post offices in Ireland since 12th December, 1903; how many of the vacancies have since been filled; and whether any, and, if so, how many, have been filled by nomination.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) Thirteen vacancies for female sorting clerks and telegraphists have occurred in the post offices in Ireland since 12th December, 1903; nine have been filled from competitions, one by transfer of a redundant established officer, and one by nomination. Two of the vacancies have not yet been filled, but these cases are being proceeded with.

Delay in Transmission of Mails from the West of Ireland to Belfast.

MR. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.) To ask the Postmaster-General if his attention has been called to complaints made to the Postmaster at Belfast regarding the non-arrival of the letters in due course of post from the West of Ireland; and, if so, will he state what is the cause of the delay and what steps he intends to take to insure punctual conveyance of the mails to Belfast from the West of Ireland in the future.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) I was not aware that complaints had been made to the Postmaster of Belfast of delay in the transmission of letters from the West of Ireland to Belfast; but I will have inquiry made and will communicate the result to the hon. Member.

Natural Fertilisers and Cotton Growing in India.

MR. EMMOTT (Oldham): To ask the Secretary of State for India whether he has any information as to the existence of natural fertilisers in India, in proximity to land suitable for growing cotton; and, if so, whether he will lay the particulars upon the Table.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) I have received from the Viceroy a Memorandum which has been prepared on the subject by the Department of Agriculture in India, and I will lay it upon the Table of the House if the hon. Member will move for it.

Memorial of Veterinary Officers of Irish Department of Agriculture.

MR. MACVEAGH: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the cause of the delay in answering the memorial of the officers of the Veterinary Branch of the Department of Agriculture for Ireland; and whether he can state when the decision is likely to be arrived at.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) There has been no avoidable delay in dealing with this matter. Careful inquiries were necessary; these have only recently been completed, and the subject is now before the Treasury for decision.

Assistants in Irish National Schools.

MR. MACVEAGH: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state if the requisite number of pupils for two, three, and four assistants in national schools will be reduced by ten, as in the case of one assistant.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The proposal is to reduce the average attendance required for one assistant teacher from sixty to fifty.

Appointment of Irish National Teachers as Secretaries of School Attendance Committees.

MR. MACVEAGH: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state if the National Board has approved of any appointments of national teachers as secretaries of school attendance committees; whether Rule 180 was intended to apply to such cases; and whether such cases come within the scope of Rule 181B.

(Answered by Mr. Wyndham.) Rule 180 (a) prohibits teachers of national schools from engaging in any business or occupation that will impair their usefulness as teachers. The position of secretary to a school attendance committee comes within this rule. Rule 181 (b) is not applicable.

Loch Leven Trout for the Upper Bann River.

MR. MACVEAGH: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Department of Agriculture will arrange to lay down some Loch Leven trout in the Upper Bann River, especially above Hilltown, where the river is free from the ravages of pike and where the tributaries are much used by trout for spawning.

(Answered by Mr. Wyndham.) Should arrangements be made locally with the object of planting trout fry in the Upper Bann in the interests of the public, the Department would be prepared to consider the advisability of making a contribution.

Advances in Aid of Irish Industries.

MR. BRIGG (Yorkshire, W.R., Keighley): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will furnish a list of the various sums advanced by the Department of Agriculture or Congested Districts Board in aid of manufacturing or other industries in Ireland, and the nature of the securities, if any, for such advances.

(Answered by Mr. Wyndham.) This information, brought down to the 31st March, 1904, is given in the following tables. In the case of the Congested Districts Board the information extends back to the establishment of the Board in 1891, and in the case of the Department of Agriculture it covers a period of four years:—

Loans made by Congested Districts Board.

Industry.	Amount of Loans.	Nature of Security.
	£	
Weaving	1,061	Personal.
Barrel making	2,452	Personal.
Straw bottle making	200	Mortgage on buildings.
Iodine making	450	Mortgage on buildings.
Boot making	150	Personal.
Lace making	604	Personal.
Brick making	50	Personal.
Woollen Factory	10,000	Secured on lands.
Total	£14,967	

Loans made by the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction.

Industry.	Amount of Loans.	Nature of Security.
	£	
Live stock	10,468	Personal.
Dairying	5,010	Personal.
Fishing	9,049	Personal.
Boot making	500	Personal.
Preserved fruit	1,000	Mortgage on buildings.
Total	£26,027	

Anglo-French Agreement—Position of Newfoundland.

MR. RUNCIMAN (Dewsbury): To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the Colony of Newfoundland is expected to derive any benefit from the Convention recently concluded between England and France; and what contribution the Colony of Newfoundland will make towards the cost of carrying out that Convention.

(Answered by Mr. Secretary Lyttelton.) In reply to the first part of the hon. Member's Question, I may quote a Resolution passed by the House of Assembly of Newfoundland on the 27th of April last: "That this House is of opinion that the Convention entered into on the 8th of April, 1904, between His Majesty's

Government and the Republic of France in relation to the rights of French citizens on the Treaty shore of Newfoundland is one which is, and will be, for the material advantage of the Colony." In reply to the second part, I have to refer the hon. Member to the text of the Bill now before the House, which proposes that the cost of carrying out the Convention shall be defrayed from moneys provided by Parliament.

POST OFFICE SITES BILL.

Ordered, That the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills do examine the Post Office Sites Bill with respect to compliance with the Standing Orders relative to Private Bills.—(*Lord Stanley.*)

HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES (RURAL DISTRICTS) BILL.

Second Reading deferred from Monday next till Wednesday next.

A QUESTION OF ORDER.

MR. CULLINAN (Tipperary, S.): Mr. Speaker, I want to draw your attention to the fact that I was one of those who took part in the division last evening, but my name is not included, although I rose in my place.

***MR. SPEAKER**: The hon. Member's name will be added. It was not, however, a division, as the hon. Member describes it.

MR. WHITLEY (Halifax): Arising out of what took place yesterday, may I ask you, Sir, what is the definition of a Member rising in his place?

***MR. SPEAKER**: The hon. Member is evidently referring to what took place before the Chairman of Committees. What occurred in Committee is for the decision of the Chairman.

MR. WHITLEY: That incident is now passed, and I am asking your ruling really for the future. The Rule says that Members shall rise in their places, but a number of Members happened to be in the House, though not in their accustomed places; they were standing but their names do not appear.

***MR. SPEAKER**: I have no doubt; everything was done in order, but I cannot interfere in the matter because obviously it is in the nature of an appeal from the Chairman. If a case arises when I am in the Chair I shall be prepared to give my opinion.

PENAL SERVITUDE BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order for Second Reading read.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's) said that as the Bill had not yet been fully explained he might be permitted to explain it now in moving the Second Reading. The object of the Bill was to amend the law relating to penal servitude in England and Wales, and to make better provision for dealing with persons on whom the ordinary sentences had no deterrent or reformatory effect. Whether the sentences were short or long, the habitual criminal returned to prison almost as soon as he was released, and in the interests of society, he thought the only thing that could be done with such persons was to segregate them for a longer period than at present, during the greater part of which, however, it would not be necessary that their treatment should be severe. It would be sufficient that they should be under discipline and compulsorily kept apart from the rest of the world. This question had been under consideration for some years, and the measure was one which had been on several occasions pressed for by this House. In 1894 the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Fife appointed a Committee to inquire into prison administration. It was a very strong Departmental Committee. The Chairman was the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Leeds, and there were also on the Committee, Sir Algernon West, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Tewkesbury Division, Dr. Bridges, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Haddington, Mr. Arthur O'Connor, now a County Court Judge, who was for many years a Member of the House, and the present Chief Magistrate of the metropolitan district. One of the most important matters dealt with by that

Committee was the question of the habitual criminal, and the Bill which he now asked the House to read a second time was based on their unanimous Report. He would read that portion of the Report on which the Bill was based. The Report stated—

> "There is evidently a large class of habitual criminals—who live by robbery and thieving and petty larceny—who run the risk of comparatively short sentences with comparative indifference. They make money rapidly by crime, they enjoy life after their fashion, and then, on detection and conviction, serve their time quietly, with the full determination to revert to crime when they come out. We are inclined to believe that the bulk of habitual criminals at large are composed of men of this class. When an offender has been convicted a fourth time or more he or she is pretty sure to have taken to crime as a profession and sooner or later to return to prison. We are, therefore, of opinion that further corrective measures are desirable for these persons. When under sentence they complicate prison management—when at large they are responsible for the commission of the greater part of the undetected crime; they are a nuisance to the community. To punish them for the particular offence is almost useless—the real offence is the wilful persistence in the deliberately acquired habit of crime. We venture to offer the opinion that a new form of sentence should be placed at the disposal of the Judges by which the offenders might be segregated for long periods of detention, during which they would not be treated with the severity of first-class hard labour or penal servitude, but would be forced to work under less onerous conditions. As loss of liberty would to them prove eventually the chief deterrent, so by their being removed from the opportunity of doing wrong the community would gain."

That Report formed the basis on which the Bill had been framed. Since that Report was published, experience in classifying prisoners and in making rules under the Prison Act of 1898 had shown the possibility of such lengthened but modified segregation. In 1899 Sir Richard Harrington, chairman of the Herefordshire Quarter Sessions, at the instance of the Discharged Prisoners Aid Society, brought the matter again to the attention of the Home Office, calling special attention to the cases of two men with eighteen and fifteen convictions respectively. In 1900 the question came up for consideration and discussion at the International Penitentiary Congress at Brussels, at which the Chairman of the Prison Commissioners contributed a very valuable paper, pointing out the remedy now suggested in the Bill. Again, Sir Robert Anderson, late Commissioner of Police, called prominent attention to this matter, especially in an article in the *Nineteenth Century*, in May, 1901. The Judges of the King's Bench Division also passed the following resolution—

> "That, in the opinion of His Majesty's Judges exercising criminal jurisdiction, the time has arrived when inquiry may profitably be held whether some modifications of the discipline of penal servitude may not safely be made, especially in respect of long sentences and into the best way of dealing with habitual and professional criminals."

That communication was forwarded to his predecessor at the Home Office; and the matter was at once taken into careful consideration. In the following March the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Croydon, then Home Secretary, addressed a letter to the Lord Chief Justice inviting the Judges to give consideration to the two following points: (1) The desirability of modifying in the direction of leniency, in the case of well-conducted convicts, the discipline imposed in the later stages of the longer sentences of penal servitude, and (2) The desirability of providing some better means of dealing with habitual or professional criminals, with a view to the more effectual protection of society against them. After consideration and consultation this Bill was prepared. In response to a request from all parts of the House, he presented a Bill last year, not with the intention of then passing it, but of allowing it to be printed for the purpose of consideration. It was not regarded as of a controversial character; but it was deemed desirable that the various authorities in the country should have time to consider it. All the communications he had received since then had convinced him that some measure of this sort was needed for the benefit of the country at large.

He would give the House one or two instances of cases from a long list which he thought ought to be dealt with under this Bill. There was the case of a criminal who in twenty-nine years had served eight sentences, five being sentences of penal servitude for burglary, and who had spent twenty-four years and nine months in prison. He was released on licence on the last occasion and within a few days he committed two other burglaries and was sent to a further term of seven years penal servitude. There was the case of another criminal who at the age of twenty (he had been three or four times convicted of burglary) was sentenced to five years penal servitude. Having earned his marks, he was released on licence, but within six weeks he was again convicted for burglary and sent to ten years penal servitude. During his sentence his conduct was very bad. He was discharged on the 4th May, 1901, on licence; and eight months later he was convicted of attempting to do grievous bodily harm to a constable, and was sentenced to twelve years penal servitude. Here was another case of a different character. A man had twelve convictions against him, eight for larceny and fraud, the sentences varying from twenty-one days to eighteen months; and four under the Vagrancy Act. Those cases were constantly occurring. For that class of criminal, prison had no deterrent effect, and he would ask the House, therefore, whether the sentences should not be longer, and whether after serving a certain portion of the sentence the remainder might not be served under lighter regulations, the whole sentence, however, being longer, in order to keep that class of criminal from preying on the public.

The proportion of prisoners with repeated convictions was constantly increasing. This was partly due to better methods of identification, such as finger prints and measurements, and partly to the constant tendency displayed during the last few years to give shorter sentences. But whatever the cause might be the system under which professional and habitual criminals constantly passed in and out of prison could not be considered good for the country either economically or morally. He had statistics taken out for the last few years with reference to the proportion of repeated convictions. On a given day in 1901 there were in prison 2,879 convicts. Of these 2,244 or 77 per cent. had previous convictions, including 1,342 or 47 per cent. with previous penal servitude. In the year 1902–3 there were 1,100 new convicts, and of these 855 or 77 per cent. had previous convictions, including 378 or 34 per cent. with previous penal servitude. Yet in 1901 726 or 25 per cent. had sentences of only three years and only 514 or 17 per cent. had sentences of seven years and over. In 1902–3 483 or 43 per cent. had only three years and only 154 or 14 per cent. had seven years or over. Therefore it was quite clear that in spite of the fact that the number of habitual criminals was growing in this country Judges were loth to pass long sentences, and he understood that they were loth because of the rigour and severity of the regulations of penal servitude. Public opinion looked upon penal servitude mainly as a punishment, and felt that it could not be carried beyond a certain limit. The main principles underlying all criminal sentences were first punitve, second reformatory, and finally preventive or deterrent. While punitive and deterrent were essential, he ventured to think that reformatory was no less important; and in first offenders was often successful. In the case of "habituals," however, it was hopeless.

The change desired was to make the punishment or treatment fit not only the crime but the criminal. In fact he would go further and say it was more important to fit the criminal even than the crime. The fit treatment for the hardened and habitual criminal was not severity of punishment so much as to keep him out of temptation for longer periods — to induce Courts to pass longer sentences by removing the severity of treatment after the punitive period. An habitual criminal who now got three years penal servitude and was then released to prey upon the public might, if the Bill passed, at the discrecion of the Judge get seven years or more, of which the first quarter, or such longer period as the Judge might direct, would be of hard labour or under the general rules of penal servitude. He would serve the remainder of the sentence under milder circumstances, which would amount really to little more than restraint. Another portion of the scheme, indeed a great part of it, was the separation of convicts into classes, and the special treatment of each class could be carried out by means of rules made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department and laid before Parliament. But it was necessary also to confer upon the Judges by statute power to direct that a portion of the sentence which they passed upon a "habitual" criminal should be served under modified conditions. This power the Bill gave in the case of convicts previously convicted at least three times, and known to be leading criminal lives, who were sentenced to terms of not less than seven years. The modified treatment would not begin till after at least one-fourth of the sentence, or, in the case of a second sentence of penal servitude, five years had been served under ordinary conditions. The rules would provide that convicts so sentenced should be placed in a special division and be allowed such relaxations and modifications of the ordinary prison treatment as were suitable for cases where detention was prolonged for the protection of the public rather than as a punishment for the last offence. The rules would also make special provision for the consideration from time to time by the Secretary of State of each convict's fitness for release. Other rules would provide somewhat similar treatment for those convicts undergoing ordinary sentences whom the Secretary of State, after they had served ten years, might think fit to place in a special long-sentence division.

He had heard two criticisms of this Bill in regard to which he would just like to say a word. Sir Robert Anderson regarded the Bill as a half-hearted measure. He thought the answer to that was that it was desirable to proceed cautiously, and that it was very doubtful whether public opinion was prepared to dispense with all statutory limits to sentences, and to send a man into confinement and leave his release or life-long detention entirely to the discretion of the Secretary of State. If the system moderately introduced in the present Bill proved successful, it might afterwards be extended, should the extension be thought desirable. Another objection taken to the Bill was that the criminal ought to be convicted of being an habitual criminal before he was dealt with as such by the Judge. But there were strong reasons in favour of the Judges being left, as now, to their discretion. Under the Bill, the crime would be proved and the Judge would then, as now, take into account the previous history of the prisoner, his character and demeanour, and pass sentence accordingly.

Mr. WHITLEY (Halifax): According to the charge.

*Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS said that in sentencing a man on a charge the Judge would take into account his history and whether he was an habitual criminal or not. It was not merely, nor indeed chiefly, the number of convictions which made a man an habitual criminal. These could be proved, but what could not be proved without alteration in the laws of evidence and the practice of the Courts was the general tenour of a man's life. The Bill was a Bill requiring careful consideration, which he thought it would get from the Grand Committee on Law. He did not look upon it as controversial, and would be glad to have help from both sides of the House in making it a practical measure. He moved the Second Reading.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid.) said the House was grateful to the right hon. Gentleman for the manner in which he had expounded this Bill. There could be no doubt that the Bill dealt with a class of criminals which the present law did not satisfactorily deal with. In the experience both of England and Scotland there were persons who were prone to be criminal, owing to some inherent defect in their nature, which no amount of punishment would eradicate. The right hon. Gentleman had given illustrations of persons who had practically lived all their lives in prison. The only effect was that they were hardened in crime and came out of prison worse than they went in. In Scotland it was lamentable to find so many people brought up before the magistrates guilty of the most petty thefts getting such heavy sentences. Experience showed that penal servitude did not deal effectively with cases of this kind which were due not only to the mental condition of the criminals, but also to the surroundings in which they lived. Such cases were also found among the wealthy classes, where people suffering from kleptomania were prone to be criminal by some aberration of nature. But when this Bill was considered it was found it was not intended to bring about any reform at all on the lines of lesser sentences. It still further increased the imprisoning process. The only thing the Bill did was to lengthen the period of relief for the public. These people were to be kept longer in prison, and all the Bill proposed to do was to separate the periods of penal servitude; one of which was to be of a strict form, and the remainder of a less rigorous nature. Did anyone suppose such a system would effect any reformation. Any advantage that would be obtained from the drastic period of penal servitude would be entirely obliterated by the more lengthened period in which they were kept in durance vile. Many expedients had been tried. When it was found that long periods of imprisonment did not effect a cure the ticket-of-leave was introduced with police supervision, but it was found in practice that the police supervision was of so stringent a nature that when men were liberated with worse than no character at all, they had no chance whatever of obtaining employment. What, under those circumstance, could a released criminal do if he wanted to earn an honest livelihood? Naturally, he was asked what was his last situation, but he could give no account of himself, and he was almost forced, once more, into criminality. Surely something more than further imprisonment was needed in order to reform a criminal. A ticket-of-leave was very well in its way, but, to do the recipient any good, it must be accompanied by some arrangement under which he would at least have the chance of getting honest employment. He did not say that there should not be some supervision, but he did say that it should be such as would not prevent the released man from getting employment or from mixing with the general public. However, when the system of ticket-of-leave was found not to work it was superseded by a system of shorter sentences.

Of late years the view of Judges had been that sentences should rather be short and sharp than prolonged, but the present Bill sought to go back to the old system of long sentences, with the mere modification of the severity of the punishment during the later period of sentence. It was noteworthy, however, that the minimum sentence which could be imposed under the Bill was seven years—and seven years of penal servitude. No discretion was to be vested in the Judge for the reduction of the sentence below that period, and he regarded the introduction of a Bill with such a minimum as contrary to modern usages and ideas. And who were the persons who were liable to have such sentences passed upon them? They were persons who had twice been convicted of indictable offences. It was not necessary that they should have before been sentenced to penal servitude, or even to imprisonment—the indictable offences might have been of the simplest description. Striking a man a blow on the nose or an offence against the Merchandise Marks Act would, either of them, be indictable offences, yet a man convicted under those circumstances might, if brought up a third time, be subjected to a term of penal servitude extending over not less than seven years. What hope would such a man have of recovering his position after undergoing a sentence such as that? The Bill, he further complained, gave no details as to the manner in which prisoners would be dealt with in the way of the reduction of sentences to good-conduct men. Another objectionable provision of the measure was that which said that a man must be proved to have been leading a persistently dishonest or criminal life. In a matter of this sort what was nominally the minor matter might well be the greater offence, since the charge on which the prisoner was being tried might be comparatively trifling. And if a man's sentence was to be doubled because of the life he had been leading there should, surely, be adduced some evidence of the life he had been leading. The jury tried the case in respect of the crime for which the prisoner was committed, but who was to try the matter of fact as to the life he had been leading? If it was to be left to the Judge, how was the Judge to determine the matter? Was there to be a second trial, after the first had closed? Because the prisoner ought, of course, to be able to bring rebutting evidence for which no provision, so far as he could see, was made in the Bill before the House. On the other hand, if the evidence as to a prisoner's life was to be laid before a jury, together with the evidence of the offence on which he was being charged, it would tend to prejudice his case, and he might be convicted, not so much on the evidence as to that offence as on the bad character which was given him in open Court. As for leaving the matter to the discretion of the Judge—well, everybody knew, from the remarks made by certain Judges in open Court, how often their lordships were influenced by momentary impressions, and one of those momentary impressions might mean seven years penal servitude to a prisoner. The lengthened period of imprisonment was not likely to do the least good, but there was every probability that it would do an immense amount of harm.

There were two or three other proposals in the Bill to which the Home Secretary had not adverted. At present the Prevention of Crimes Act applied to a man only when he committed an offence. If a constable was satisfied that a convict on licence was getting his living by dishonest means he could arrest him without a warrant. But getting one's living by dishonest means was an offence which everybody would agree should entail the forfeiture of the licence. Moreover, one of the conditions of the licence itself was that the holder should not habitually associate with notoriously bad characters. What more than that was wanted? It was now proposed to add the words "or is habitually consorting with thieves and bad characters." That was a very dangerous provision to insert, because a man might live in a locality in which there were dishonest people whom he knew and would speak to, without necessarily himself joining in their pursuits. It was really imposing upon a man an impossible standard of morality. Were there no bad characters in the wealthier classes? What was a "bad character"? It was not defined in the Bill. The question would probably be decided on the evidence of a detective who could never see any good in a man who had been once convicted; he would say that the man was consorting with thieves, and the forfeiture of the licence would follow. The general form in which a licence should be given was laid down by the Act of 1864, and if any departure from that form was made in a particular case it had to be laid on the Table of both Houses of Parliament. That was a very proper safeguard; it prevented favouritism, or the imposition of extreme conditions. It was now proposed to sweep away that safeguard. He had no objection to special conditions being attached in special cases, but why should this safeguard be taken away? It was of the greatest importance that the House of Commons should know exactly how the Penal Servitude Acts were being administered, and he hoped the Home Secretary would see that the abolition of this safeguard was not in the public interest. He admitted that the Bill was an honest attempt on the part of the right hon. Gentleman to work out a reform as far as he could without going into the region of philanthropy; but, though the intention was good, but the Bill failed to carry it out.

Mr. H. D. GREENE (Shrewsbury) said he understood from the tone of the speech of the hon. Member who had just sat down that he cordially agreed with the attempt made by the Home Secretary in this Bill to deal with a matter which had been before the House for something like ten years. He agreed with many of the remarks which had fallen from the hon. Member opposite, but he hoped that no one would move the rejection of this Bill, and that it would be sent to the Standing Committee, where many of the objections which had been raised could be duly considered. If the Home Secretary had desired to make a stronger case he could easily have done so. He might have referred to the Report of the Committee which sat in 1894, which was appointed by the right hon. Gentlemen the Member for East Fife, whose distinguished management of the Home Office had effected a vast number of improvements in the administration of those branches of the law with which that Office had to deal. Then there were the Judicial Statistics of 1897 and the present year, and also the Reports of the Prisons Commissioners, including those from Scotland, which were issued a few days ago. The Home Secretary might have pointed out in all those documents evidence in support of the proposals that the unfortunate class of persons dealt with by this Bill ought to be treated upon a new system. In the Judicial Statistics of 1897 the uselessness of imposing sentences of penal servitude on these people was very forcibly pointed out, and it was clearly shown that neither penal servitude nor long terms of imprisonment served to deter this class from resorting to crime again. The Prison Commissioners in 1902 pointed out that out of 2,879 persons who in that year were serving sentences in the convict penal establishments, 1,342 had been previously sentenced to three terms of imprisonment exceeding six months or to penal servitude. Out of the convict population at that time forty-six per cent. had been convicted or sentenced to long terms of imprisonment or to penal servitude. The Report which was issued in 1902 stated that the time had now come when some form of special detention should be devised by which these criminals might be segregated for long periods at a time.

It seemed to him that there were two dangers in connection with this Bill, and he wished to ask the Home Secretary how far he would allow these dangers to be dealt with by the Committee. He wished to point out that this measure provided no fresh or additional punishment. The hon. Member for Mid Lanark seemed to think that the imposition of seven years was a fresh kind of sentence but that was not so. At the present time the Court had power to impose penal servitude for not less than three years and varying from seven years to penal servitude for life. The Bill left the Court power to impose the maximum sentence, but it provided a less severe mode of serving the part of it. The detriment to the prisoner was that they attempted to cut off the right to earn a ticket-of-leave. That was where the prisoner would suffer. The prisoner was to be sentenced as now, but at the present time if a prisoner was sentenced to seven years penal servitude he had remitted, if he behaved himself properly, one year and nine months and he only served five years and three months. Under the new system the prisoner would not get the chance of earning that remission. They were told in the prison reports that the great advantage of the system was that this practice of remission filled the prisoners with hope. The prisoner was hopeful in the hours of solitary confinement, and that was found to be very beneficial. The opportunity of getting liberated sooner was an incentive to prisoners to behave well, but the result of this Bill would be that the sentence would be the same, but the prisoner, instead of having the chance of a ticket-of-leave, would be kept in prison on new and different terms. What would be the effect of passing a statute of this kind on the mind of the tribunal imposing the sentence? They were told by the Prison Commissioners in their Report of 1902 that the professional class of criminals might be segregated by order of the Court for longer periods of time for their last particular offence. That provision was intended to encourage Judges to look at the maximum sentences that might be imposed. If the Judge had got before him a person belonging to this professional criminal class he might think that the best thing in the interests of the prisoner and of the public would be to impose the maximum sentence, and the prisoner might be sentenced to fourteen years penal servitude, three years and six months of which he would undergo under the new treatment for this habitual class. He would serve ten years and six months in the ordinary prison discipline, and three years and six months he would have to live under the habitual criminal class treatment. He should not object to that altogether if some safeguards were introduced which he would allude to.

He wished to point out to the Home Secretary that this Bill differed from the recommendations in the Reports of the Prison Commissioners in two matters. The Committee of 1894, established by the then Home Secretary, reported that the new form of sentence should not be left to the discretion of the Judges. That was what he attached very great importance to. As the Bill stood this system might be administered not only by Judges but also by recorders and chairmen of quarter sessions. There were some 200 or 300 recorders and chairmen of quarter sessions who had nothing in common to bring them together in order to exchange thought as to the best way in which punishment should be dealt out; and what was more, they were not all educated in law, although he would trust those recorders who were trained lawyers, with this power. He should, however, resent giving to chairmen of quarter sessions the power to impose the maximum sentence of penal servitude, a power which they would have if this Bill passed. A chairman of quarter sessions, anxious to do his best towards the prisoner, might say that fourteen years penal servitude was the wisest sentence he could pass, but if he did that there might be a very great hardship to the prisoner. Those gentlemen might have exceptional views in regard to punishment and this Bill would put it into the power of a chairman of quarter sessions, untrained as a lawyer and not coming into association with others administering the law, to impose a very long sentence upon a prisoner, much longer probably than the Judges would impose. The Judges of this country were only fifteen or sixteen in number, but they were persons who frequently exchanged views in respect of the period of punishment which ought to be imposed. He thought that in a case where they were giving power to one class of Judge to impose a maximum sentence as a experiment, they ought in the first instance to limit that experiment to the Judges of the High Court.

The proposals of this Bill differed as to the nature of the offences from the recommendations of the Commissioners and of the officials of the different prisons who had reported upon this question. The Prison Commissioners made the proposal with reference to professional criminals, which term they used in a technical sense as meaning men whose record showed that they had lived systematically by thieving and robbery. The Judicial Statistics of 1897 referred to the cases of persons who went wrong from a settled intention to gain a living by dishonesty. If they turned to this Bill they would see that it was not only offences of dishonesty which fell within its purview. He was quite willing to accept the Bill if it was modified to meet the wishes and suggestions of the Prison Commissioners and the other bodies who had considered the matter. The Bill was intended to deal with "any person who has previously been convicted more than twice of an indictable offence." There were a vast number of indictable offences, such as stealing apples, the theft of the fraction of a penny, bigamy, and perjury; there were also political crimes which were indictable offences, and which had nothing to do with theft or dishonesty, and he would be no party, so far as he could prevent it, to allowing quarter sessions to use convictions on these and other matters as a pretext for imposing the maximum sentence when this highly beneficial measure came into operation. He hoped that when the Bill came before the Standing Committee on Law the Home Secretary would assent to an Amendment limiting the words in the Bill as drafted to such indictable offences as involved fraud and dishonesty, because it was people who were guilty of fraud and dishonesty they wished to bring within its operation.

There was a great deal of force in the criticism which had been made on the proposal that a prisoner ought to be allowed to prove before a jury what kind of life he had been leading. As one who had been constantly engaged for many years in the administration of the criminal law he felt very strongly in the matter. He had over and over again in the Assize Courts and in quarter sessions seen placed on trial a person who, perhaps, was particularly obnoxious to the police. When the prisoner had pleaded guilty he had seen a policeman volunteer that he could give information as to the life of the prisoner. Some Judges allowed this and some resented it. In many instances statements which had no bearing on the charge before the Court were made. They were more or less prejudicial to a prisoner, and he was bewildered by them, but, having no friends, no lawyer, and no opportunity of knowing the things that were to be brought forward, he was speechless, and the Judges were sometimes prepared to act on the information. For himself, he never would listen to anything of that kind. In considering the punishment to be awarded—the most difficult thing a Judge had to determine—he ought not to allow anything which spectators would consider unfair and unjust when brought forward against a prisoner to weigh against him. It seemed to him that what had been proved in the case then before the Court, or proof of previous convictions, should be sufficient to justify a Judge in reference to the sentence he had to pass. By a trifling Amendment when the Committee stage was reached it would be very easy indeed to deal with the matter, and probably the Amendment would be accepted by the Home Secretary, who had invited suggestions, and who was apparently anxious to co-operate with hon. Members on the other side in getting a solution of this most difficult question.

There was one other matter which he would respectfully ask the Home Secretary to consider. When the Prisons Bill of 1898 was before the House, the Home Secretary of the day was pressed by the Irish Members, and others on both sides, to place on the Table of the House the existing rules applicable to prison procedure, and he did so, and also undertook to place in the hands of the Committee upstairs the rules proposed to be brought into operation under that Bill. There was a disposition on the part of the Members of the Committee then not to allow the Bill to pass unless the Home Secretary gave some information as to the rules. The draft rules were submitted to the Committee, and the rules which subsequently came into operation were those which had been discussed and approved. He would respectfully ask the Home Secretary to do the same thing on this occasion. The House did not know what sort of treatment was to be meted out to these people. The House ought to know how they were to be treated, whether they would be allowed access to their friends, whether missionaries and others might visit them, and whether they would have the relaxation of attending lectures such as was now given under the Prisons Act of 1898. They ought to know all that before they gave the Home Secretary power to make the rules. He felt very strongly on this subject, and if that appeal did not meet with encouragement he would take other opportunities of pressing it on the attention of the House. The wretched man who got into the position of being subject to the provisions of this Bill was probably the victim of heredity or want of opportunities in life, and he was absolutely helpless. It was for them to see what they could do for him. They must, therefore, see what the rules were to be. He had no doubt the Home Secretary would give them some information on that point. The last speaker stated that the Bill did not show that it would reform the criminal. The disclosure of the rules might perhaps throw great light on that matter. They would then see whether after the punitive treatment the course to be adopted would have a reforming effect on the prisoner. He would await with great interest the result of the appeal he had made to the Home Secretary. They all knew that, after the passing of a Bill, when rules were laid on the Table of the House it was hopeless in the way business was conducted in that Assembly to get sufficiently strong support to a proposal to alter the rules. He sincerely believed that if this Bill was considered by the Standing Committee on Law in the same spirit as animated the Committee when dealing with the Bill of 1898, this Parliament would be able to produce something which would be of inestimable value in the future.

*SIR JOSEPH LEESE (Lancashire, Accrington) said he did not by any means find great fault with the Bill, but there were certain details which required amendment to make the measure a useful one. He desired to associate himself with the excellent statement made by his hon. and learned friend, and especially with the suggestion that the Home Secretary should provide the Committee which considered the Bill with copies of, or at all events a sketch of, the rules he proposed to draft under the Bill. The practice of putting rules which were drawn up by the Home Office on the Table of the House for forty days was more or less a farce. He never knew what part of the Table to search for them. As regarded the schedule of previous convictions, he wished to know whether the operation of the Bill would be of such a character as had been foreshadowed by his hon. and learned frend. To say that a poor woman who stole a piece of bread or an apple should be subject after two convictions of that kind to a possible term of seven years penal servitude was a monstrous proposal and no proper-minded Judge would think of giving such a sentence. He wished to see the prisoner safeguarded by some clear statement in the Bill of the class of previous convictions which should be followed by the exercise of the power, given in the Bill, to award seven years' penal servitude. Previous speakers had asked for something in the nature of a second trial to prove that a man had, in fact, been leading a criminal life. He would be the last to suggest interference with anything which would protect the prisoner; but did the House know what really happened under certain circumstances? For ten years as Recorder of Manchester he had been in a responsible position as a criminal Judge, and when a man with previous convictions was brought before him he was furnished with a calendar setting forth the whole of the criminal life of that man. In some cases the record was a terrible one, and he could not see what benefit there would be to anybody in having a second trial in such cases, because it would mean simply calling evidence to prove previous convictions. Sometimes men with bad records were brought up, men who had been in penal servitude, but who perhaps for ten years had had no record against them. Under such circumstances, he was only too anxious to deal leniently with a man, because there was a strong presumption that the man had been trying for a period to get an honest livelihood. He, therefore, obtained the assistance of an able inspector of police whose duty it was to supply him with a history of the life of the man in order that he might satisfy himself that the prisoner had tried to live an honest life. That was an illustration of what he thought was very desirable in criminal Courts, but he did not know that it could be made a part of the statute. If a prisoner could gain anything by having previous convictions proved against him, by all means let it be done; but in nine cases out of ten when a man had a long list of previous convictions against him, the Judge was fully armed with all the information he required. He was bound to say that in passing sentence Judges were sometimes a little apt to forget the prisoner's future. When a man was convicted of a serious offence for the first time and sent to penal servitude, especially if he were a young man, the Judge ought not to forget that he had a future. The paramount duty of a Judge was to protect the public, but if consorting with criminals produced criminality, as no doubt it did, a Judge ought to be only too glad to protect a person convicted for the first time by placing him in a class separate from others. He gathered inferentially that that was a part of the intention of the Bill, and, approving of the principle of the measure, he should vote for the Second Reading.

Sir **HOWARD VINCENT** (Sheffield, Central) said that this was a subject in which criminologists of all nations were very much interested, and they were greatly indebted to his right hon. friend the Home Secretary for this attempt to deal with it. The subject was one full of difficulty, and, as having had some experience in the matter, he would like to say one or two words on the question. No one had been more anxious than he had been not to send to prison persons whose offences had been committed either in youth or under circumstances of great pressure and want, and he had had the good fortune in 1887 to pass through that House the First Offenders Act, which had been taken advantage of very largely throughout the country, and had saved from imprisonment some 70,000 persons in England and Wales. But the great difficulty which always beset everybody who had had to deal judicially, magisterially, or from the police point of view, with crime was the difficulty of the habitual offender. Some remarkable articles had recently appeared by Sir Robert Anderson which showed the enormous increase in habitual offenders, but the Judicial Statistics showed this most clearly. The habitual criminal was not only a danger to society but he acted as a tempter to young people to indulge in a criminal life. All his influence was for the bad. What had been done by the present Home Secretary and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Fife in the direction of separating classes of criminals, and in preventing the young prisoner from coming in contact with the old and habitual criminal, was worthy of all praise, and had been attended with very considerable advantage. The Judicial Statistics for 1902, which were of a very remarkable and serious character, showed that offences against property with violence had considerably increased in that year, and amounted to 2,850, and the Home Office had explained that part of that increase was due to the long-observed growth of offences by habitual offenders. He found that 9,138 prisoners had been brought before assizes and Courts of quarter sessions for criminal offences, of these 5,678 had been previously convicted, and 4,055 had been convicted three times; 408 had twenty previous convictions; 914 had between eleven and twenty; 2,647 had been convicted more than six times, and of the 9,138 no less than 845 had previously undergone penal servitude, and 555 had been previously convicted more than five times for the offences of burglary, house-breaking, and shop-breaking. The effort which had been made in this Bill to do something to deal with this very serious problem of the habitual offender was deserving of all support that could possibly be given to it. It was not necessary to enter into details. He sympathised a great deal with what had been said by the hon. Member for Shrewsbury as to the necessity of exercising great care with regard to the rules under which the Act would be put in force. The [views of, experts like the hon. Member for Accrington should receive every possible consideration on behalf of society at large, on behalf of the protection which it was necessary to afford to society against wrong-doers, and on behalf of the taxpayers who supported habitual criminals for long periods of years. He desired to give this Bill hearty support, and he trusted it might be referred to a Committee by which the details would be thoroughly threshed out. Great progress would then be made in criminal science in this country.

*MR. TOULMIN (Lancashire, Bury) said it was perfectly true as stated by the Home Secretary that the existence of habitual criminals was not good for the country. Of course not, because it was the habitual criminal who kept alive that most vicious class, the receiver. It was the receiver who encouraged crime who was supported by habitual criminals and by him the young were trained in criminal paths. The frequent returns to crime ought to lead us to consider whether habitual crime was due merely to original sin on the part of the criminals or whether it was not a sign of the failure of our present system; whether the curative element in the punishments we inflicted ought not to be strengthened, and whether we ought not to pay more attention to physical and industrial training throughout our prison system. The Home Secretary had seemed to suggest that vagrancy very often shaded off into crime, and he (Mr. Toulmin) could not help thinking that if vagrancy were effectively dealt with, it would have a great deal of influence on the disappearance of the habitual criminal. In the State of Massachusetts mercy was exercised with the very best effect in the earlier stages of crime. He could not help thinking that we in this country had begun at the wrong end. If we had seen some of these criminals before they became habitual and had dealt with them then, the problem we had to solve would have been much easier than it was at the present time. There was considerable force in the objection of the right hon. Gentleman that the power of determining an indeterminate sentence was not one which should be exercised by the Secretary of State, but the question of indeterminate sentences could not be excluded from consideration simply because it was not desirable that they should be revised by the Secretary of State. He himself could imagine a case where the length of a sentence was not determined, and where such sentence might be subject to revision after a certain period by a Court of law and where, by that means, a revision by the Secretary of State might be avoided. Care should also be taken that where this provision was exercised against a criminal he should have the right to be heard. A great deal might be said in favour of a separate charge being made against a criminal after he had been convicted of the offence which had brought him before the Court; whether there should not be a separate charge making him liable to be dealt with as an habitual criminal and so giving an opportunity to his counsel to be heard upon what appeared to him to be a second charge.

If all the Bill did was to make the law more drastic and severe, which in his opinion was not desirable, he could not view it with favour. He viewed with a certain amount of horror these long sentences of penal servitude; fourteen years was a large part out of a man's life, and he could not view with sympathy such a term being extended. He could not get away from the fact that the habitual criminal ought to be looked upon as one mentally infirm, and therefore he hoped this Bill would not shut the door of mercy. The good or the evil which would result from this Bill would result from the way in which it was carried out, from the rules made by the Department, which were, he understood, to be laid before the Committee. The end of prison life should afford the means for a criminal being re-absorbed in the social life of the nation. A man was frequently accused of associating with habitual criminals. How could it be otherwise? When he came out of prison where was he to go? He, of course, went back to his friends. Where else was he to go? If this Bill afforded a man an opportunity of doing something when he came out of prison it might effect some good; but if it was merely to rid society of the pest of the habitual criminal he could not view it with favour. If it was the beginning or the extension of a wise system by which an endeavour would be made to treat the diseased minds of habitual criminals, and to individualise each case, then the Bill would be likely to do a great deal of good. And with that hope he would have great pleasure in supporting the Second Reading.

SIR ERNEST FLOWER (Bradford, W.) congratulated his right hon. friend the Home Secretary on the reception which his Bill had met with, and cordially wished it a successful and speedy passage into law. He believed that it would make an extremely useful addition to the great Prisons Act of 1898, of which it was the necessary result, because the experience gained from the working of that Act had shown an enormous defect as to classification. He noticed from the Report of the Prisons Commission of 1900 that only a fraction of 1 per cent. of the star class had been reconvicted. Under the rules of the Act of 1898 there was the star class composed of persons who had not been previously convicted or who were not habitual criminals or corrupt persons; the ordinary class, and the intermediate class. Under this Bill he presumed there would be a fourth class, which would be called the habitual offenders' division. He agreed with his hon. and learned friend the Member for Shrewsbury that, when they came to consider it in the Standing Committee on Law, they should have furnished to them in the form of a Memorandum the special rules which would be made for the class of prisoners dealt with in the Bill. They did not want to take away any of the privileges which were secured by good conduct on the part of the prisoner and which were now embodied in the rules framed under the Act of 1898.

*MR. BRIGG (Yorkshire, W.R., Keighley) did not think the Bill was of much value. He had read it and had doubted whether he ought to vote for it, and now that he had heard the disquisition of the right hon. Gentleman he was still uncertain as to which course he ought to take with regard to it. It modified some part of the sentence in the habitual criminal division, but he did not know whether it made a man better off or worse off, having regard to the knowledge in the man's mind that no part of his sentence would be remitted. The management of our prisons had now been taken out of the hands of the justices and had been vested in the hands of Commissioners, and the Prison Commissioners, with whom he had been associated from time to time, had developed the management on a different line. Formerly the Justices gave the prisoner some industrial work to do and gave him when he left a small share of his earnings, so that he could make a start when he went out of prison. A certain amount of work was a great relief to a prisoner, and if he had work to do he became interested in it and it did away with the evil which was engendered by long years of imprisonment. If there had been some attempt made to ameliorate the position of those who were in prison, or, better still, if there had been some attempt made to prevent the habitual vagrant from becoming an habitual criminal, he should have viewed the Bill with more favour. He did not wish to go the length of moving the rejection of the Bill, but he hoped that in Committee the Home Secretary would give most favourable consideration to Amendments which had a tendency to ameliorate the position of prisoners and to treat them as human beings.

*MR. TREVELYAN (Yorkshire, W. R.,) Elland) said every body would agree that the most interesting speech of the debate was that of the hon. and learned Member for Shrewsbury, but it was extremely damaging to the Bill before the House. He agreed with his hon. friend the Member for Keighley that this was an extremely petty measure, and would probably be an extremely useless piece of legislation. Our prison system certainly required a great deal of reform and amendment. It was extremely doubtful whether professional crime was not on the increase in this country. The unfortunate character of the monotony of our present prison treatment afforded no cure for the bad character of the inmates of our prisons. In fact, its deadening influence destroyed any good the inmates might have had in them, and they left the prisons worse than when they entered them. Another objection was that the Bill would not prevent constant recurrence of crime in the same individual when he left prison. There was nothing in it which was likely to relieve the monotony of prison life, for one of the noticeable features of the Bill was that if a man had been previously convicted he had to serve at least five years under the ordinary rules before he was subjected to the treatment which was expected to improve him, and was left during that time in the company of other criminals. The chief difficulty under which the House laboured in discussing the Bill seemed to lie in the absence of any statement on the part of the Government as to what the treatment of the habitual offenders' division was going to be, for that, after all, was the whole gist of the matter.

There were, at the present time, several schemes which were being tried. There was that of a segregation of first offenders from habitual criminals. This was first done in '97 or '98, and had been going on during the last five years. He would like to know whether, in the division of first offenders from habitual criminals, there was to be any difference of treatment, or whether the rules would merely provide for the separation of the two classes and leave the criminals whom it was specially sought to reform in practically the same position as ordinary criminals. Another scheme which was being tried in at least one prison was what was known as the Borstal system, from which he would have had more hope than from the Government proposal, since it was calculated to build up, in some measures, the self-respect of the criminal. One could only get from the rules, of course, an outline of what it was supposed to be, but those rules were given in the prisons' Report of 1902, and the effect of them was that they classified offenders into various grades and provided for their instruction in useful trades, for special exercise, and for special dietary. This was, in effect, the system which had been initiated in the Elmira Prison in New York, and he thought the House might well ask to know whether the rules to be introduced under the Government's present Bill would be based on similar lines. For himself he thought the chief fault of the Bill lay in the fact that it began at the wrong end, for it seemed to him that it would have been far better to lay stress on the improvement of the first offender rather than to deal, at the outset, with the habitual criminal. It might be, indeed, that was the intention of the Government, but then they should tell the House so. He thought the Government would have done much better if they had taken all the first offenders in the country and boldly initiated a large scheme under which they could have given to the controllers of the prisons power to shorten sentences and let prisoners out if they regarded them as cured or on the way to being cured. There should be greater latitude in bringing the sentence to an end in accordance with the development of the prisoners under treatment. There was nothing of this character in the Bill.

With regard to the treatment of habitual criminals it was a very strong measure to give power to a Judge to punish a prisoner not only for the offence for which he was tried but for a past offence without going judicially into what this past offence was. That question might, however, be dealt with in Committee. The way to treat habitual offenders was to adopt a very rigid system of imprisonment, and if the habitual offender was of a serious kind he had no objection in theory to excluding him permanently from society, for he agreed, in the main, with Sir Robert Anderson's view in favour of the permanent exclusion of habitual criminals of a serious kind, and that it was the only way in which criminals of that nature could he stamped out. He did not think there would be much hope of improving habitual criminals by a few years of better treatment towards the expiration of their sentences. It might be tried, but he did not think it would succeed, and he thought there might well be considered the desirability of keeping under permanent control habitual criminals unless it was shown that there was a reasonable prospect that they would go back to outside life with the intention of living respectably. He trusted that if the Bill became law it would first undergo very material amendment, and he hoped, in the meantime, that some clearer announcement than had, so far, been made by the Government would be forthcoming.

Mr. WHITLEY characterised the Bill as right in its intentions but wrong in its methods. It did not carry out any of the points recommended by Sir Robert Anderson. It would be possible under the Bill for this kind of thing to happen. A man might be apprehended on a charge of stealing a pocket-handkerchief and convicted, and then the Judge might, before pronouncing sentence, say, "I see you are an habitual criminal. I will sentence you, not for stealing a pocket-handkerchief, but because you are an habitual criminal." The prisoner's defence was by this time closed, and it seemed to him a very un-English plan and a very undesirable plan that they should give a Judge power to sentence a man for a crime with which he had not been charged. This question could not be dealt with in Committee, because it went to the very root of the Bill, and that led him to oppose the measure. Why, he asked, could the Government not have proceeded on the lines recommended by Sir Robert Anderson? If a man was definitely charged with being an habitual criminal, he would at least have a chance of defending himself, but under the Bill a prisoner would have two charges to answer—that set out in the indictment and another entirely different, which latter would not be entered upon till, as he had said, the defence was closed. He ventured to press the Home Secretary very strongly upon this point, and to ask him to undertake in Committee to favourably consider the complete recasting of the Bill in the sense he had suggested. If this was done he felt quite sure that the Home Secretary might rely upon the support of the House for much more stringent methods of treatment for this class of habitual offenders than he could do under the Bill in its present form. It would be perfectly just to impose a long period of separation from society on these persons. The striking thing was that this class of habitual criminals was so small, and that the amount of crime perpetrated by this class was so large. It was a matter for congratulation that the class was small, and it was a strong case for attempting to deal with that class. He would ask the House to hesitate before bringing about so un-English a procedure as that of sentencing a man for a crime with which he was not charged and upon which he was not allowed to bring forward a defence. These men should in justice be told what the charges against them were and be allowed to make a defence. He was satisfied that both the House and the public were prepared to adopt new methods of dealing with these men who were so twisted in the brain that no amount of imprisonment would reform them. Something between penal servitude and a model hospital should be provided for them where they would not be able to prey upon society. He again asked whether the Home Secretary would not withdraw the Bill in its present form, or, at least, assure the House that he would be prepared to consider in Committee very wide Amendments on the lines that had been suggested.

Colonel SANDYS (Lancashire, Bootle) said that, though he had no special qualification for joining in the debate, he was thoroughly in accord with the Bill which the Government had introduced, since it provided for more stringent legislation against a certain class which was in perpetual conflict with the laws of the country. He had no sympathy with those who were actuated by the wish to make things comfortable for the habitual criminal, who was already better lodged, fed, and generally cared for than many honest people in civil life. His own view was that the law should be made so strong as to exercise a deterrent effect on the persistently criminal classes, and he should support the Bill before the House in the belief that that would be its tendency.

MR. HALDANE (Haddingtonshire) said that so far as the principle underlying the Bill was concerned, he was strongly in favour of it. It was really the outcome of a movement which first took practical shape nine years ago, when a Committee was appointed to consider the subject, but the Government were now making a further step in the direction of the policy then initiated. Reference had already been made to the extremely interesting articles by Sir R. Anderson, but the public were also greatly indebted to Sir Evelyn Ruggles-Brise, who had taken up the Report of the Committee in the spirit in which it was intended, and had done a great deal of continuous work in developing the prison system. One could recognise his hand in co-operation with the Home Secretary in the fashioning of the proposals of the Bill under discussion. The broad principle of the measure might be said to be classification of prisoners. Roughly speaking, there were three classes of prisoners, viz., those who were inexperienced, so to speak, and capable of being reformed; those in regard to whom one could consider little more than their punishment; and those who deserved not only punishment, but also to be looked upon as being incapable of becoming useful citizens—men who had become habitual criminals, and who, while being treated humanely, ought to be segregated, because they had a bad and corrupting influence on the whole tone of prison life. After all, there was a "tone" in prison life as in everything else. A number of men could not be placed together without there being a tendency for the better to fall to the level of the worse, unless steps were taken to prevent the lower element obtaining the ascendency, and the whole trend of recent reform had been in the direction of separating the worse from the better in order to give the more hopeful cases a chance of redeeming their characters.

One of the great difficulties successive Governments had had to contend with in attempting a reform had been the total absence of any common principle in the sentences of the Judges, and this Bill certainly did contain a principle which the Judges would have to consider when they came to sentence prisoners of this class. Proposals had been made for some sort of inquiry whereby Judges might be brought to adopt a common standard in regard to sentences, but it was an extremely difficult thing to do because of the different views held by different Judges with regard to different crimes and criminals. It was a defect in any proposal that the reform should be carried out entirely by the Home Office without a report from the Judges whose large experience might enable something like uniformity to be introduced into the matter. The Bill dealt with persons who had been previously convicted more than twice of indictable offences, and two conditions had to be fulfilled before the measure came into operation. The first condition was that the person had been living a persistently dishonest and criminal life. He presumed that that would be ascertained in some fashion subsequent to the verdict of the jury; it would be very unfortunate if it should be in any way introduced in the course of the trial itself. The second provision was that the Judge should be satisfied that it was expedient for the protection of the public that the man should be kept in detention for a lengthened period of years. He did not agree with the hon. Member for Halifax that that was such a very difficult thing to determine. An experienced Judge would be able to settle the matter by the record of the prisoner and the impression made upon him by the evidence at the trial. Moreover, the Home Office would still have power to shorten sentences if necessary, and he had always thought that the power of the Home Office was infinitely preferable to a Court of Criminal Appeal in that matter. He had known cases in which the Home Office had been able to revise the decision of a Court and jury where no Court of Criminal Appeal could have dealt with the matter, and grave injustice had been averted or redress given. He was not afraid to entrust the Judges with the discretion given by this Bill, the power of the Home Office remaining as at present.

He could not help feeling, however, that there was a certain amount of vagueness in the Bill. Rules were to be framed after its passage constituting an habitual offenders' division and prescribing what was to take place in that division. The habitual offender was not less entitled to the consideration of Parliament than any other member of the community, and, in the interests of justice and of humanity, it was only right that if he was to be set apart for the sake of the State, the House should see that his treatment was intelligible, rational, and, as far as consistent with the dictates of justice, mitigatory of the hardship of his position. It was a terrible thing for a man to be adjudged to have forfeited the rights of citizenship, and he would like to have heard much more concerning the nature of this division. Propositions of this kind, in view of their gravity and importance, ought to come, in the first instance, before the House for consideration, and have their general principles embodied in the legislation the House was asked to pass. An opportunity should be given to Members to form an estimate of what this habitual prisoners' division was likely to be and of passing a judgment upon the proposal. The nature of that division depended upon the Secretary of State, and there had been times when the martinet system had been much more in favour than at present. One of the things against which the Committee of 1894 protested was the militarism of the prison system; prisoners were looked upon as so many numbers; there was no discrimination, and the result was a uniform plan which frequently bore most hardly upon the individual. The constitution of a new division such as was now proposed would present a strong temptation to men of the martinet type to revert to the old view, and he did not want to see that happen any more in the case of the habitual offender than in the case of the young offender. The general principles upon which the division was to be constituted were not declared in the Bill, and that appeared to him to be the worst part of the measure. The broad principle was a step in the right direction, but though he had great confidence, both in the present Home Secretary and in Sir Evelyn Ruggles-Brise, they could not be certain into whose hands the administration of this matter might ultimately fall, and he thought the House itself ought to be afforded an opportunity of forming an estimate of what the rules under the Bill were going to be. He hoped this point would receive the earnest attention of His Majesty's advisers. Good intention and good principle were not enough; the working out of the measure was the important thing; and it created a certain amount of misgiving in his mind that Parliament should be asked to put so much power, without supervision, into the hands of men who might carry out the system in such a fashion as would lead to great injustice.

MR. RUNCIMAN (Dewsbury) said he agreed to a large extent with his right hon. friend that one great fault of our prison system was a lack of classification, and we had apparently made no great advance so far as this Bill was concerned. His own feeling was that the rules to be framed under the Bill would be infinitely more important than the Bill itself. The most important part of our prison system ought to be classification, and the classification at present was a mere rough-and-ready one, based not on the causes of crime, but on the crimes themselves. Anyone who knew anything whatever about the science of criminology, knew that no classification could be more rough-and-ready, and certainly none could give less clue to the character of the criminal, or the possibility of reforming him, than the present system. It was perfectly true that the Prison Commissioners differentiated between crimes against the person and crimes against property, but that was a very broad distinction—a distinction, however, which was important, inasmuch as the crimes against property were very much more on the increase amongst the worst class of offenders than mere crimes against the person. The causes of crime might be roughly classified as being brought about by want, or by passion, or by drunkenness, or, finally, by an inherent tendency to theft or other crime which could not be classified under the heads already given. How classification such as they had in the Bill was likely to arrive at a distinction between any of those causes he failed to see. It was perfectly clear if our prison system was to do any good whatever it must attack the mental and physical condition of prisoners in a much more scientific way. The fact was that of all social sciences that of which least was known in the United Kingdom was the science of criminology. That was to a considerable extent due to the fact that our prison system was largely a military system, and that the Governors were selected not because of their knowledge of criminology but because of their services in entirely different walks of life. Certainly the most important matters to be considered in connection with the rules were not only the effect habitual offenders had on the public themselves, but the effect that those rules would have on the criminal. He for one certainly did not look forward with much hope to any good being done by any rules which did not attempt to treat a criminal as an individual suffering from a disease—mental, physical, or moral—as distinct from the fact that he was a man who was a danger to society. Simple seclusion and lifelong sentences would certainly cure any evils which could arise from the criminal being brought into contact with society or being a parasite on our social system; but it would be necessary to adopt something much more scientific than that if they were to turn a criminal into a better being when he came out of prison.

Crimes against property were caused in the main by the fact that the criminal thought he had a more pleasant, profitable, and easy method of getting a living than by other means. In American reformatories, and to a certain extent at Borstal, efforts had been made to teach the criminal that there were better ways of making a livelihood than by theft. He was taught a trade so that he might be able, when he left prison, to earn a regular wage free from the annoyance of the police and other surveillance, and to see that on the whole it was better to be honest for his own sake—which was perhaps the only consideration that would appeal to him in the first instance. It was equally true that where kleptomania on a large scale was developed in an individual that could be affected by both physical and mental training. He did not wish to see the whole of our prison system based on that of Elmira, but certainly some of the results there had been most remarkable. Whether by mental or physical training they had enabled a large number of their discharged prisoners to obtain respectable employment after their confinement was over, and to become useful members of the community instead of being parasites on society. The system which was instituted in England—the Borstal system—of allowing a certain amount of good conduct to be rewarded by earnings ought to be carried further, so far as the habitual offenders were concerned, not only in order that they might recognise that ordinary effort would bring its own reward, but in order that when they left prison they might have something to start with, so that they would not be driven, on the first day of freedom, to take to their old methods of life. The limit under the Borstal system was, he believed, £2. That sum was something, and ought to enable a man to live for a fortnight without resortng to his old practices. But that limit ought to be extended, certainly so far as habitual offenders went, with the idea that these men might be taught by their own efforts that they could provide themselves with the means of keeping body and soul together, and of giving them a certain amount of comfort.

Then he thought they might well revert to the old system of transportation. He knew transportation was by no means popular in Europe. Perhaps that was all the worse for Europe. But the fact remained that men of the habitual criminal class if they were transplanted into other phases of life, very frequently secured a perfectly honest livelihood. In Australia an enormous number of the criminal class had been absorbed into the population, not altogether to the detriment of the general community. Experiments made in some of the South Sea Islands had certainly produced results beneficial to those incarcerated, and large numbers of them had returned to honest livelihoods; indeed, so far as he could gather there were many now, both in the Antipodes and at home, whose ancestors were in those settlements for a large number of years, and left them as honest men, perfectly prepared to be absorbed into the ordinary industrial community. The Home Secretary had said that he was not prepared to make any great advance in our prison system, because public opinion was not sufficiently advanced. He appealed to the right hon. Gentleman to do something to advance popular opinion. He would do nothing to advance public opinion by merely juggling with sentences. To alter a sentence from five years to seven would not do much. If they wished to do anything with the criminal class they should deal with it as with any other problem; they should apply to it all the knowledge of social science at their command, and then they might have some hope of turning a large number of these habitual offenders into honest and industrious citizens.

*THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. COCHRANE, Ayrshire, N.) thanked the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Haddingtonshire for his clear exposition of the Bill, and associated himself with the right hon. Gentleman's appreciation of the efforts of Sir Evelyn Ruggles-Brise in the matter of prison treatment generally. This Bill was to a certain extent a compliment to the efforts made at Borstal. The Borstal system sought to cut off the source of the supply of criminals, and was a sort of corollary to the reformatory system, which had had such successful results. He wished hon. Members would take more interest in industrial and reformatory work. He could cite a case in which 91 per cent. of young criminals had been reformed. Similar efforts were made at Borstal with an older class of prisoners, who enjoyed special privileges and were put to work of an interesting character and to trades which would be useful to them in after life. The system had not been in operation long enough to tell exactly what the results would be, but he had seen it at work, and he thought there was every hope that the manufacture of young criminals would be partly stopped by the reforming influences which were brought to bear upon them. In answer to the Member for Mid Lanark, he observed that the Bill provided no increase in the power of the Judge to give sentences, but if the Judge gave a sentence of seven years, a portion of the period might be served under modified conditions. It was intended to place the new rules in the hands of hon. Members before the Committee stage of the Bill; but he would be glad to give a general sketch of them if desired. The object was to try to humanise these prisoners. After they had served a certain term of penal servitude, they would be separated from the other prisoners, and they would wear a special dress, different from that worn by convicts of the ordinary division. It was intended that they should earn money by their own industry, and should be encouraged to fit themselves for civil life on leaving prison. One of the bad effects of the present system was loss of initiative by those who came under its influence. The Home Secretary had power to advise remission of sentences, according to the conduct of the prisoners, and that he thought, met the point raised by the hon. Member. With a portion of the money they would be entitled to earn by their own industry they could purchase increased comforts for themselves.

As to proving a man to be an habitual criminal, the mind of the Judges had been most carefully ascertained. The Bill was considered at a meeting of the Judges last year, and they expressed a practically unanimous opinion in favour of it; and they were also unanimously of opinion that the matters to be considered under the Bill should not be the subject of proof by formal evidence or subject to cross-examination, but that the Judges should continue to act as at present in dealing with a prisoner's antecedents. He thought that met the argument of the hon. and learned Member behind him and also the case put forward by the hon. Member for Accrington, who had detailed his own wide experience in this matter of obtaining evidence as to character, which carried conviction that the methods he pursued were adequate and sufficient. The proposed amendment of the Prevention of Crimes Act, 1871, in Section 2 of this Bill, had been criticised by the hon. Member for Mid Lanark. The only object of that was to give a police-constable power to arrest a convict, not only if he got his living by dishonest means, but also if he was found to be habitually consorting with thieves or bad characters, and to give a Court of summary jurisdiction power to forfeit the licence. As to publishing information in regard to convicts' licences by laying it upon the Table of the House, if that information became public it might make it impossible for the people who desired to employ a criminal from doing so, and life might become a burden to that man. Under the present system if a man sought employment there was the stigma of the licence resting upon him. He thought the effect of this Bill would be to make it easier for these men to lead a better life, and it would not place any obstacles in their way. He thought that most of the points that had been raised could be discussed and considered in Committee. All the Home Secretary was anxious to do was to amend the Bill in such a way as would improve it and lead to its successful working.

MR. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs) said that the Government appeared to have approached the Bill in a spirit of good intention, but the debate had fully justified the position taken up by himself and others, that the Bill ought not to pass entirely as an unopposed measure. He had listened attentively to the debate, and he confessed that he was not quite sure whether the Government considered that they were bringing forward this measure in the interests of the prisoners or the public. They had to consider first of all that the particular class of prisoner which this Bill was intended to deal with was, after all, the product of our civilisation. It did not necessarily follow that a man of this class was a vile character who committed crime for his own personal benefit, but in most cases he was the result of the sins of society and of our present social conditions. No matter how well-intentioned these men might be they were born in such conditions that it was almost impossible for them to be anything but criminals, and they must take care that while pretending to do something for this most unfortunate class they did not actually make the law more severe for them than it was at present. What did this Bill do? At the present time, when a man was released from penal servitude, he was released upon a licence. Under the present law he had to report himself every month at the local police station, and if he failed to account for himself he was liable to have his licence cancelled, and he also rendered himself liable to be sentenced to a period of one year's hard labour. Surely that was an infliction quite severe enough. One would have thought that the right hon. Gentleman would have left out that part, but under the present measure the mere fact that one of these men might meet a person of doubtful character, or if he was seen talking to such a person, would give the police authorities power to cancel his licence and prosecute him. This Bill dealt with the question of these licences, and the freedom which a convict was supposed to enjoy when he came out of prison. He thought that in this respect the law was sufficiently strong already, and there was no necessity to make it any stronger. It was very difficult for a man at the present time, after having been in penal servitude, to get an honest living, for his footsteps were dogged at every turn, and his only chance was to change his name and go to another country. This Bill would make it still harder for him to get an honest living, and if he happened to associate with characters of doubtful reputation, he could be arrested. He thought that was going a little too far.

Was this a Bill in favour of prisoners so far as the inside of the prison was concerned? Was it in the prisoner's interest? The tendency of this measure would undoubtedly be to make sentences longer. The Judges would almost be compelled to make the sentences at least seven years in order to secure for the prisoner this period of reformation. He thought this was against the interest of the prisoner. Upon this point he hoped the Government would keep an open mind. Let the House imagine the case of a poor man who might be undefended, and after his case was finished a record was brought up against him going back thirty or forty years. When that record was read out, what opportunity would that man have of saying, "I am not the same person." He could not properly reply to the convictions brought against him under such circumstances. He was aware that this was the practice at the present time, for every time a person was convicted the police were asked what they knew of the prisoner. It was possible at the present time to take that into account, and the whole point at issue seemed to him to be whether the Judge was to take into view the infliction of a shorter sentence or a longer one in the new division as suggested by the Government in this Bill. Therefore this measure, from the prisoner's point of view, because of its severity with regard to his outside treatment, was not in favour of the prisoner. He very much doubted whether the Bill was to the advantage of the public. It seemed to him that the fact that the public were going to pay the extra expense for these particular characters being kept in prison longer than at present was no benefit to the public. One thing was fatal, and it was that it shut out all hope of the future during the time the prisoner was in prison. During the shorter period he had a chance of reforming and living outside, but now they were introducing a new crime and a new punishment which was longer and without any adequate compensation, so far as the prisoner was concerned. With regard to classification, it had been suggested that the Government were going to do something to carry out the recommendations in the Report of the Committee. The Home Secretary had power at present to do all that he proposed to do under this Bill in the way of classifying prisoners and sending them to different prisons. The right hon. Gentleman already had power to set aside particular prisons for this purpose, and that met the case which the Government desired to deal with. This measure went much further than the Report of the Committee. At the end of their Report the Committee stated that to lay down that the prisoner should be regarded as an habitual criminal did not meet the case. If they allowed this Bill to pass a Second Reading now it would have to be most carefully considered and amended in Committee, or otherwise it would be necessary to oppose it on the Third Reading. This question should not be dealt with in pieces, and he regretted that effect had not been given to other recommendations of the Report on which this Bill was framed, and that the whole subject had not been dealt with in a broader fashion. He hoped the Report of the Judges which had been quoted would be in the hands of the House in time for the deliberations of the Committee. He would not challenge the Second Reading, in view of the promise of the Government to consider Amendments in Committee, but would reserve further action till the Third Reading.

Mr. HEMPHILL (Tyrone, N.) said the Bill before them dealt with matters of such importance that he did not think he should be doing his duty to his constituents if he did not express his views upon it. He was greatly disappointed that the Bill did not seem to him to remedy what was admitted to be a very great evil. One of the greatest reproaches to their criminal jurisprudence was the want of uniformity attending the sentences of Judges in these cases. Another great reproach was their complete failure to carry out one of the principal objects of punishment, namely, the reformatory object. They had failed signally in that respect, and nobody who read this Bill impartially could assert that it remedied either of those reproaches. The Government were now trying to reverse the whole principle upon which our penal servitude system was based. Penal servitude was substituted for transportation, and one of the earliest changes made after the introduction of the new system was to introduce an arrangement by which the sentence for a certain period of penal servitude might, if the prisoner conducted himself properly, be reduced. That arrangement had been going on for years, and, as was pointed out by the hon. Member opposite, a sentence of penal servitude for seven, ten, or fifteen years did not necessarily mean that the prisoner was to be in gaol all that time, but that there was a sliding scale to reduce those periods if the prisoners conformed to the prison rules. That system opened a window of light into the darkest dungeon, which enabled even the blackest criminal to hope for some improvement in his lot. That arrangement was based upon principles of justice and humanity; but this Bill, without suggesting any real improvement or modification, altered and reversed that principle, and that was one reason why he strongly opposed it. They were told that—

> "Hope springs eternal in the human breast,"

but the effect of this Bill would be to extinguish every spark of hope, because, in the case of a sentence of seven years penal servitude, the Judge would have the power to deprive the prisoner of his liberty for the whole of that period. Under the present sliding scale a prisoner could regain his liberty at the end of three or four years in the case of a sentence of penal servitude for seven years, but under this Bill the prison door was shut upon him for seven years, the only difference being that after a certain number of years he would undergo a different system of discipline. That was a very great change which ought not to be made without the strongest possible reasons. At the present time Judges took such different views in passing sentence after a prisoner had been convicted, and one Judge might give a sentence of seven years where another Judge might only give twelve months imprisonment. It was a matter of common knowledge that the outer world was often outraged by the great contrast in the passing of sentences. A Judge who was inclined to be severe might give seven years under the provisions of this Bill, while another Judge in a similar case might think that the case would be met by giving a less severe sentence. In no direction did this Bill protect the public to any extent, while on the other hand it might be fatally injurious to the hopes of the prisoner. If the Judge gave a sentence of penal servitude the offender would have no option but of spending the balance of the term in prison. One of the evils of the present system was that an immense number of unfortunate persons were sent to prison and kept there for periods at the public expense. That was a necessary consequence of the sentence. The effect of carrying out the provisions of this Bill would be that no adequate or compensating advantage would be derived from imposing on the public a great additional burden, because a prisoner would know that, no matter how well he had conducted himself, he would necessarily be retained to the end of the seven years, whereas under the present system he would only be retained for three and a half or four years. That might be a low ground for opposing the change, but it was one which should not be lost sight of when considering a great reform. If the reform necessarily redounded to the benefit of the State or the prisoner, of course, that consideration would be deserving of no weight.

There was also an objection advanced by one of the speakers in the debate which had received no answer. It was suggested by the Home Secretary that this Bill would be for the benefit not only of the public but of the prisoner. The first section of Bill said—

> "Where any person who has previously been convicted more than twice of an indictable offence is convicted on indictment of an offence punishable with penal servitude, and it appears to the Court—(*a*) that at the time when he committed the offence for which he is to be sentenced he was leading a persistently dishonest or criminal life; and (*b*) that by reason of his criminal antecedents and mode of life, it is expedient for the protection of the public that he should be kept in detention for a lengthened period of years, the Court may, if it thinks fit, in passing a sentence of penal servitude for any term of not less than seven years, direct that, after serving a portion of his sentence under the general rules relating to sentences of penal servitude, he shall serve the residue thereof in the habitual offender division."

Therefore, looking to the professed object of the Bill, it was not for the benefit of the prisoner. The measure professed to be for the benefit of the public, but he doubted very much whether it would in any way serve that purpose, because there was no reasonable ground for hoping that a man after being kept in prison for seven years was likely to come out a better man than if he had become free at the end of four years. There was no ground either in statistics or philosophy, or from experience, which would lead to that conclusion, and therefore, regarded from that point of view, it appeared to him that this Bill, if it became law, would be a failure. The procedure proposed by the Bill was to apply when a person had been convicted more than twice of an indictable offence. At present, when a man was tried before a jury he was tried simply on the issue whether he had committed the charge in the indictment. When the prisoner was convicted on that charge, what was the duty now to be laid upon the Judge? The Judge, from his own inner consciousness, as it were, had to form an opinion upon such information as he might get, as to whether this man had been leading "a persistently dishonest or criminal life." How was the Judge to form the opinion? Was it from the information of a police officer? Was it from the information of the prosecutor? What *data* had the Judge to go upon? The jury would not be called in here. They had already a precedent for the jealousy of the law with regard to the jury not knowing the antecedents of a person who was charged with a crime except so far as his antecedents might appear in the course of the sworn evidence. When a prisoner had been convicted of a former offence, he was tried for the new offence, and in order to entitle the Judge to give a higher sentence in respect of the former conviction, the former conviction had to be formally proved and the prisoner was again given in charge of the same jury to ascertain whether he was guilty of the charge on the former occasion. There was no amendment of that procedure in this Bill, nor could there be any such provision introduced. Some Judges might be more prejudiced than others. He spoke from considerable experience in this way, having for a considerable number of years been chairman of quarter sessions and engaged in administering the criminal law in different parts of Ireland. He thought it would be an unreasonable burden to throw upon any Judge to determine merely upon what might be hearsay whether a man was leading a persistently dishonest or criminal life. Nothing could be more vague and indefinite. It was a matter which should be proved by positive evidence before the only tribunal which, according to our Constitution, was competent to weigh evidence where the liberty of the subject was involved, namely, a jury. That was the objection he had on constitutional grounds to the Bill. He was afraid from his experience of the Standing Committee on Law that very little effort would be made to introduce any Amendment which would prevent that unjust result from occurring.

There was another matter in the Bill which had also been adverted to and which, he thought, was not sufficiently met by the speech of the Under-Secretary. It had reference to Sub-section (1) of Section 2 which said—

> (1) Section 3 of the Prevention of Crimes Act, 1871 (which imposes penalties on convict holders of licences getting their livelihood by dishonest means), shall have effect as if after the words 'is getting his livelihood by dishonest means,' in both places where they occur, were inserted the words 'or is habitually consorting with thieves or bad characters, or has otherwise broken the conditions of his licence.'"

Coupling that with the provision in the following section, which would enable a constable to arrest a ticket-of-leave man without any warrant, a constable would be the judge whether a man "is habitually consorting with thieves or bad characters, or has otherwise broken the conditions of his licence." What was the meaning of "consorting with thieves or bad characters." They were the waifs and strays of the world. They reminded one of the famous saying of Jeremy Taylor, who, on one occasion when walking along what was now Oxford Street, saw an unfortunate prisoner being carried to execution. Jeremy Taylor said, "There but for the grace of God goes Jeremy Taylor." They must all recollect that. They must recollect the temptations to which these people were exposed. They must recollect their surroundings, and that when they came out of jail it could not be expected that they should always be found in the best company. A constable would be apt to jump to the conclusion that a man who had been convicted was habitually consorting with thieves or bad characters. [Laughter.] It was very easy for Gentlemen who lived rosy lives to laugh at an allusion to the misfortune of their fellow subjects, but there were men who even had sympathy for those who, under temptation, committed crime, and he for one should be sorry if it should ever be supposed that he was callous or indifferent in that respect. They were bound, he thought, in dealing with the criminal law to regard not only the interest of the public and of property, but also to render the condition of the prisoner as good as it could possibly be made consistently with the preservation of public rights. He thought the Bill failed in that respect, and he opposed it because he thought there ought to have been first of all, what he understood had been suggested by predecessors of the Home Secretary, namely, a Commission composed of the very highest authorities at the command of the Government to inquire into the whole system of punishment and the classification of prisoners. That Commission could have considered the whole question of the inequality of sentences and the variation in the conclusions the Judges drew in different places as to the punishment which should be awarded for the same kind of crime.

MR. CROOKS (Woolwich) said he was delighted that the Under-Secretary talked of the source of supply of criminals, and he wished to refer to that point. He should like to know who was to decide what were "bad characters." Were the "bad characters" the men who wore black coats and high hats and lived no one knew how in the West End, or the poor creatures, crowded into night shelters and other places, without visible means of subsistence in the East End? Many persons could not tell how the better-dressed man gained his living, whether by honest or dishonest means; and it was quite certain that in the other case hunger drove many to adopt bad courses. They could not tell in regard to many people in towns what they did for a living. He supposed that a man would be quite safe so long as he associated with people in the West End who did nothing useful for a living. What evidence would satisfy a Judge that a person was consorting with people of bad character? There would be very few indeed who could undergo an investigation of that character. The House did not seem to realise where human nature came in. A Judge might be exceedingly generous some days, and on other days when something had spoiled his digestion he might be very hard. It was necessary that Parliament should safeguard the people who were unable to look after themselves. Had they found honest work for all the people who were willing to do honest work? If not they must take their share of responsibility for people who were driven to dishonesty for the purpose of maintaining themselves. Hunger was the great motive power which made people do dishonest actions. It was now fifty-three years since the Hardwicke Reformatory was first opened in Gloucestershire. From that time reformatory schools had been built, sometimes under municipal, and sometimes under private control. He ventured to say that it was always a mistake to leave reformatories or industrial schools in the hands of private individuals. It should be the duty of the State to provide these institutions. He wanted to prove that this Bill would be absolutely unnecessary if they would cut off the source of supply.

*MR. SPEAKER: This is a Bill dealing with the punishment of hardened offenders and not with youthful offenders.

MR. CROOKS said that what he contended was that if there were no youthful offenders there would never be a development of hardened offenders. The point he wished to make was that the Home Office at this moment neglected its opportunities in not preventing the development of the hardened offender. The children of parents who had no use for them except to beg or thieve were sent to reformatories and industrial schools, and when the boys and girls had become trained and useful members of society the parents were then allowed to claim them. There was no cause for wonder that these children should relapse into the old criminal habit. The hardened criminal was made by the system of society prevailing to-day, and the Bill would not help in its reformation. What was wanted to reclaim the hardened criminal was an organised system of labour by which the discharged prisoner should be provided with the means of earning an honest living and hindered from drifting back to his old haunts and habits of life. If at the expiration of his term of imprisonment a man was assisted to make an honest living and encouraged to believe that he was not a mere animal, something would be done to make him a useful member of society. Surely they had not reached the limit of legislative power in dealing with criminals. What he complained of was that a man was always more hardly dealt with if he had offended against the laws of property than if he had done violence, say, to a woman. He appealed to the House to do something to protect the criminal against himself, and to make him a producer instead of a consumer.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty) said that some effort should be made to reform the system of punishment of criminals. They had been told how prisoners had been treated in days gone by, and that now they were very kindly treated with extremely satisfactory results. It was said that some criminals were beyond redemption, but he did not believe that this Bill would help to redeem them. He was very glad to say that he had never been an inmate of a prison, but from all that he could learn he believed that the only ray of hope which a prisoner had was that at the end of a certain period he would be liberated, and that encouraged him to obey the prison rules. What he objected to was that the moment a man who had served his sentence went out of prison, the police dogged him, and if he found a situation, the poor fellow lived in terror lest he should be informed upon. He believed the majority of criminals were capable of reform under proper care; and what was wanted was a better classification of criminals in prison. When in India, he found that they had a most excellent system of classification there, and he was told that it had worked very well. Some such system as that should be adopted in this country. Hardened criminals and younger offenders should not be brought together, and the latter should be taught some useful trade, so that when they came out of prison they might be employed in honest work, instead of running after cabs to get 6d. or 1s. for handling luggage, or holding a horse. The Bill was so vague in its terms that it ought to be materially altered in Committee or thrown into the waste basket.

MR. SLACK (Hertfordshire, St. Albans) said that the first section of the Bill was so vague that the House ought to have more light upon it before the measure became law. The old harsh system of penal servitude had been long ago condemned. What was wanted was a system of discipline, or even training, which would make crime odious and even detestable to the criminal. Whilst the main scheme of the Bill was laudable, there were certain points which would have to be carefully considered in Committee. In the first section, for instance, a person who had been twice convicted of an indictable offence was brought within the scope of the Act, though many offences which were indictable were not the more heinous or more serious offences contemplated by the framers of the Act. Again, what was to be the criterion or test as to whether a person were leading a "persistently dishonest or criminal life?" The condition was alternative, and the allegation that a man was leading a "dishonest" life was very vague and very wide. Moreover, it had not been made clear by the Government in this debate what was the real difference between the treatment of a prisoner under the "general rules" and that in the habitual offences division.

MR. SECRETARY AKERS-DOUGLAS rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The House divided:—Ayes, 181; Noes, 71. (Division List No. 133.)

AYES.

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Alsopp, Hon. George
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster,Rt.Hn.HughO.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt.Hn.Sir H.
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon.A.J.(Manch'r
Balfour,RtHn GeraldW.(Leeds
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon.Allen Benjamin
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles,Lt.-Col.H.F (Middlesex
Bowles,T.Gibson (King's Lynn
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brymor, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V.C.W.(Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, RtHnJ.A.(Worc.
Chamberlayne, T. (S'thampton
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Craig,Charles Curtis(Antrim,S.
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Denny, Colonel
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale,Rt.Hon.SirJoseph C.
Dorington,Rt. Hn. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, SirWilliam Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Dyke,Rt.Hon.SirWilliam Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber,Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fergusson,Rt.Hn.Sir J.(Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Fitzroy,Hon.Edward Algernon
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster,Philip S.(Warwick,S.W.
Gardner, Ernest
Gordon,Hn.J.E.(Elgin&Nairn)
Gordon,Maj.Evans(T'rH'mlets
Gore,Hn.G.R.C.Ormsby-(Salop
Gore,Hon.S.F.Ormsby- (Linc.)
Graham, Henry Robert
Greene,Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.)
Groves, James Grimble
Gunter, Sir Robert
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton,Marq.of(L'nd'nderry
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Hatch, Ernest Fredrick Geo.
Hay, Hon.Claude George
Heath, James (Staffords. N.W.
Henderson, Sir A.(Stafford,W.)
Hogg, Lindsay
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Hozier,Hon.James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Jessel,Captain Herbert Merton
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Kenyon-Slaney,Col. W. (Salop.
Kimber, Henry
Laurie, Lieut-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence,SirJoseph(Monm'th)
Lawson,JohnGrant(Yorks.N.R
Lee,ArthurH.(Hants.,Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long,Col.Charles W.(Evesham
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter (Bristol,S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver,SirLewis(EdinburghW,
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Milner,Rt.Hon.SirFrederick G.
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morpeth, Viscount
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray,RtHn.A.Graham(Bute
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rasch, Sir Frederick Carne
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Rothschild,Hon.Lionel Walter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel,SirHarryS.(Limehouse
Sandys, Lieut.-Col.Thos. Myles
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley,EdwardJas.(Somerset)
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord(Lancs.
Stroyan, John
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot,Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent,Col.SirC.E.H(Sheffield
Walrond,Rt.Hn.Sir WilliamH.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby,Lt.-Col.A.C.E.(Taunton
Whiteley,H(Ashton-und.-Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Wilson, John (Glasgow)

Wilson-Todd, Sir W. H. (Yorks.
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ambrose, Robert
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Cremer, William Randal
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Horniman, Frederick John
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Kearley, Hudson E.
Lambert, George
Leng, Sir John
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow W.
Partington, Oswald
Perks, Robert William
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robson, William Snowdon
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shaw, Chas. Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Slack, John Bamford
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R. (Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Weir and Mr. Eugene Wason.

Question put accordingly, and agreed to. Bill read a second time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be committed to the Standing Committee on Law, etc."—*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*

And it being after half-past Five of the clock, and objection being taken to Further Proceeding, the debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed upon Monday next.

OUTDOOR RELIEF (FRIENDLY SOCIETIES) (No. 3) BILL.

*SIR **EDWARD STRACHEY** (Somersetshire, S.) moved that the Order for the Second Reading of this Bill be discharged and the Bill withdrawn. He said he did so in order to facilitate the passage of another measure, copied from his own, which had been introduced by the hon. Member for South Derbyshire on the other side of the House, and he would appeal to his hon. friends on his side of the House not to oppose the other Bill.

Motion made, and Question, "That the Order for the Second Reading of this Bill be discharged, and the Bill withdrawn," put and agreed to.

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

INDIAN ARMY (MEMORANDUM).

Order [19th May] for an Address for a Return relative thereto read, and discharged; and, instead thereof—

Indian Army (Memorandum). Address for "Return of the Memorandum recently issued by General Lord Kitchener of Khartoum and the Local Commander-in-Chief in India upon the organisation and training of the Army in India."—(*Sir Howard Vincent.*)

Adjourned at twelve minutes before Six o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 6th June, 1904.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS (PETITION FOR ADDITIONAL PROVISION) (STANDING ORDERS NOT COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the Petition for additional provision in the following Bill, the Standing Orders have not been complied with, viz.:—Saddleworth and Springhead Tramways (Abandonment) Bill. Ordered, That the Report be referred to the Select Committee on Standing Orders.

DEAN FOREST BILL (STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE THERETO COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, referred pursuant to the Order of the House of the 1st day of June, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz.:—Dean Forest Bill.

London United Tramways Bill (King's Consent signified). Bill read the third time, and passed. [New Title.]

Middlesborough, Stockton-on-Tees, and Thornaby Tramways Bill (King's Consent signified). Bill read the third time, and passed.

Thames River Steamboat Service Bill (King's Consent and Prince of Wales' Consent signified). Bill read the third time, and passed.

North-Western Electricity and Power Gas Bill; Skipton Water and Improvement Bill. As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

North British Railway (General Powers) Order Confirmation Bill. Read the third time, and passed.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions for alteration; from Jura; and Forres; to lie upon the Table.

HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES, ETC., BILL.

Petition from Portsmouth, against; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions against; from Hindley; Kingsley; Bristol; Southampton; Westminster; Dunfermneli; Greenlaw; Pontardulais; Llandilo; Plymouth; Frodsham; Alva; Chester Stafford; Crouch Hill; Pembroke; Oldfield; Brighouse; Streatham; Elland; Sheffield; Swansea Valley; Langhor; Forest Fach; Pontardawe; Porteynon; Dorking (two); Reigate; Red Hill; Manchester and Salford; Islington; Allendale; Lower Bantham; Balscote; Horley; Watford (four); Rickmansworth; High Bentham; Battersea; Portsmouth (six); Langton Matravers; Gainsborough; Walsall; Aston; Keasden; Warmwell Heath; Osmington; Chickerell; Wyke Regis; Westham; Weymouth (two); Upwey; Broadway; Preston; Winfrith; Miles Platting; Reynoldstone; Oxwich; Pitton Gower; Llangennith; Horton; South Norwood; Cardiff (three); Felling (two); Venerable Bede; Bill Quay; Armadale; Manchester; Croydon (two): Abingdon; Cefn Crib; Stockport (five); Newmilns; Ayr; West London; Woodside; Fortune's Well; South Stockport; South Watford; Easton (two); Ince in Makerfield; Settle; Bentham; Peterborough (three); Haddenham; Northampton; Bolton; Neithrop; Wincanton; South Cheriton; Hemel Hempstead: Burton-in-Lonsdale; Haslingden; Lochwinnoch; Kingsthorpe; North West London; Neilston; Fortrose; Newcastle-on-Tyne; Rossendale; Cloughfold; Bacup; York; Calverley; Falmouth (two); Newby; Kingston; Pontnewynydd; Bretherton; Hamworthy; Newtown; Higher Lytchett; Nuneaton; Dunkswell; Fauldhouse (two); Banbury; Ashton-under-Lyne; Abergavenny (two); Finstown; Brixton; Ryecroft; Cullingworth; East Morton; Leamington (two); Warwick; Auchterarder; Burrelton; Nottinghamshire;

Keyworth; Rock Ferry; Batley; Keighley; Wallingford; Herston; South Wales and Monmouthshire; Southsea (two); Wolverhampton (two); Heronsgate; Pinner; Batley; Sturminster; Worth Matravers; Wareham; Parkstone; Morden; Kenson; Waterloo; Lower Lychett; Binegar; Easkote; Shutford; Birkenhead (four); Mount Tabor; Bonsall; Coupar Angus; Methven; Nuneaton; Diss; Corfe Castle; Northampton; and Swindon; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions for alteration; from Ramsbury; and Bridgwater; to lie upon the Table.

PARLIAMENTARY FRANCHISE.

Petition from Warwick, for extension to women; to lie upon the Table.

RATING OF MACHINERY BILL.

Petition from Sheffield, against; to lie upon the Table.

SINGH, MAHENDRA MAHARAJAH MADHAVA.

Petition of Mahendra Maharajah Madhava Singh, for redress of grievances; to lie upon the Table.

VALUATION BILL.

Petitions for alteration; from Croydon; St. Marylebone; and Bridgwater; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

AGRICULTURE AND TECHNICAL INSTRUCTION (IRELAND) ACT, 1899.

Copy presented, of Three Minutes by the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction for Ireland sanctioning forms of Instruction for the county borough of Cork and the urban district of Athlone [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

WEST AFRICA.

Copy presented, of Statement of the Revenue and Expenditure and the Trade of the Gambia, Sierra Leone, and the Gold Coast, from the year 1895, and of Lagos and Southern and Northern Nigeria from the year 1900 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

CROWN AGENTS.

Return presented, relative thereto [Address 17th May; *Mr. Herbert Samuel*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 194.]

LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL.

Copy presented, of Returns relating to the Council up to 31st March, 1904, with Estimate of Expenditure for the year ending 31st March, 1905 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 195.]

EXPLOSIONS (MESSRS. CURTIS'S AND HARVEY'S FACTORY AT CLIFFE, KENT).

Copy presented, of Report by Major A. Cooper-Key, His Majesty's Inspector of Explosives, to the Secretary of State for the Home Department, on the circumstances attending an Explosion of Nitro-glycerine in the separating house of the Factory of Messrs. Curtis and Harvey, Limited, at Cliffe, Kent, on the 18th February, 1904 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

POLLING DISTRICTS (COUNTY OF STAFFORD).

Copy presented, of Order made by the County Council of the County of Stafford altering certain Polling Districts in the Handsworth Parliamentary Division [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

POLLING DISTRICTS (WEST RIDING OF THE COUNTY OF YORK).

Copy presented, of Order made by the County Council of the West Riding of the County of York altering certain Polling Districts in the Hallamshire Parliamentary Division [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3177 to 3179 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PIER AND HARBOUR PROVISIONAL ORDER (No. 1) BILL [LORDS].

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 3rd June; *Mr. Bonar Law*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 196.]

PIER AND HARBOUR PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 2) BILL.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 3rd June; *Mr. Bonar Law*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 197.]

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

Public Records (Home Office). Copy of Schedule containing a List and Particulars of Classes of Documents which were returned to the Office of His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Home Department, and which are now in the Public Record Office, but which are not considered of sufficient public value to justify their preservation therein [by Act].

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Annoyance caused by Heavy Gun Firing off Torbay.

Sir JOHN KENNAWAY (Devonshire, Honiton); To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if instructions may be given to abate the nuisance caused to the inhabitants of Exmouth, Teignmouth, and other places, by the constant firing of heavy guns off Torbay by His Majesty's cruiser "Undaunted," and that the firing may take place at sea or on some less frequented part of the coast.

(*Answered by Mr. Pretyman.*) The Admiralty is anxious to minimise the annoyance complained of, so far as may be compatible with preserving the gunnery efficiency of His Majesty's ships, and have given instructions accordingly, and have also directed inquiry to be made with a view to a change of locality. Owing, however, to the strong tides on that part of the coast within the Devonport command, the large amount of coastal traffic, the number of fishing vessels, and the necessity which exists for mooring the targets in comparatively shallow water, the difficulty of selecting an alternative practice area is considerable.

Delay in Erection of Coastguard Station at Arryheera, County Donegal.

Mr. O'DOHERTY (Donegal, N.): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether, in view of the fact that tenders were invited over twelve months ago for the erection of a coastguard station at Arryheera, county Donegal, and that the tender of Messrs. Stewart and Co., contractors, Belfast, was accepted, he will explain why no instructions have been given to the contractors since the acceptance of the tender to proceed with the work; and state what is the cause of the delay in the erection of the building.

(*Answered by Mr. Pretyman.*) After tenders were invited for new buildings, unforeseen difficulties arose in connection with the owner's title to part of the land leased to the Admiralty for the new buildings, the result of which has been that another site has had to be selected. The lease will shortly be completed, and the new buildings proceeded with in due course.

Promotions of Senior Assistant Clerks.

Mr. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury how many promotions have taken place, under Clause 15 of the Order in Council of 29th November, 1898, of senior assistant clerks to the second division, and the number of such promotions, to date, in each office, including Ireland.

(*Answered by Mr. Victor Cavendish.*) List of Promotion to the Second Division of the Civil Service from the ranks of the Senior Assistant Clerks of the Abstractor Class, under Clause 15 of the Order in Council of 29th November, 1898:—

Admiralty	16
Agriculture and Fisheries, Board of	3
Agriculture and Technical Instruction (Ireland), Department of	1
British Museum	1
Charity Commission . . .	3
Customs	1
Deeds, Ireland, Registry of .	1
Education, Board of (including former Science and Art Department)	27
Home Office	2
Inland Revenue . . .	13
Local Government Board, England	11
Local Government Board, Ireland	6

National Education Office, Ireland	2
Patent Office	9
Public Works Office, Ireland	1
Registrar General's Office, Scotland	1
Scotch Education Department	2
Scottish Office	1
Seamen's Registry Office	5
Stationery Office	6
Trade, Board of	4
Valuation Office (Ireland)	2
War Office	8
Works, Office of	2
	128

Meal Reliefs in Liverpool Post Office.

Mr. SHACKLETON (Lancashire, Clitheroe): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that instructions have been issued at Liverpool that on such attendances as 11 a.m. to 7 p.m., 11 a.m. to 8 p.m., and noon to 8 p.m., not more than ten minutes should be granted for tea relief; and, if so, whether, in view of the fact that such a limitation does not allow sufficient time for the purpose, he will direct that the fifteen minutes hitherto granted shall be restored.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) Under the regulations of the Department a refreshment interval of thirty minutes is provided for on the duties to which the hon Member refers. As the hours of attendance are somewhat inconvenient as regards meal times a further short interval of ten minutes is allowed, as an act of grace, if the work admits of it, and I see no reason for extending this interval.

Appointments for Male Telegraph Learners in Liverpool Post Office.

Mr. SHACKLETON: To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that there are at Liverpool sixty-five male telegraph learners waiting appointment, thirty-nine of whom are fully qualified, all receiving 6s. per week, and that these learners have been informed that they can only be appointed as vacancies occur which it is necessary to fill; and, if so, whether, in view of the declaration of official witnesses before the Bradford Commission that the Post Office endeavoured to place learners upon the establishment after twelve months service, he will take steps to provide the youths with appointments.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) There are at present seventy male learners at Liverpool. Of these thirteen have been nominated for vacant positions as sorting clerks and telegraphists, to which they will be appointed in due course. Candidates for learnerships are informed before they enter the competitions that vacancies for sorting clerks and telegraphists occur at irregular intervals, and that no assurance can be given as to the time within which an established appointment will be obtained. I regret that until vacancies occur I am unable to provide the other youths with appointments.

Postal Duties for Oxford Telegraph Staff.

Mr. WILLIAM JONES (Carnarvonshire, Arfon): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that for some time past endeavours have been made to compel the telegraph staff at Oxford to perform postal duties, and that they have been informed that they would be removed compulsorily to other offices in the event of the men declining to perform those duties; and whether, in view of the declaration of previous Postmasters-General, that telegraphists entering the service before 1896 are exempt from the performance of postal work, he will explain the reasons for this action.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) The telegraph work at Oxford has of late considerably fallen off, and there is consequently not sufficient work to keep the officers in the telegraph office fully occupied. Their services have therefore to be utilised for the benefit of the Department in such a manner as the exigencies of the service require. All officers of the Department are expected loyally to perform any work required of them which they are capable of undertaking; and unless some means can be found to utilise the services of redundant telegraphists at the offices where they are at present employed a transfer to another office is the only alternative.

Telephonic Connection with Tipperary, Clonmel, and Cahir.

MR. CULLINAN (Tipperary, S.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether, in the scheme decided on for telephonic connections with Tipperary and Clonmel, he will have Cahir, which is situated midway, included.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) Cahir is situated in the Clonmel exchange area. The National Telephone Company have an exchange at Clonmel, and I have been in correspondence with the company on the question of the connection of Clonmel with the telephone trunk system, and the establishment of an exchange at Cahir in communication with that system through Clonmel. The company state that they will open an exchange at Cahir provided sufficient support is forthcoming, and that they are now making inquiry on this subject.

Pay and Promotion of London Sorter Tracers.

MR. KIMBER (Wandsworth): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he will state if he has received a memorial from the London sorter tracers, dated 26th March, 1904, asking for permission to personally lay before him their claims as regards pay and prospects of promotion; and, if so, will he accede to their request.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) The memorial has been received; but until the Report of the Committee on Post Office Wages has been fully considered, I am not prepared to give a definite answer to the request of the memorialists.

Condition of Oak Trees in Richmond Park.

MR. JOHN HUTTON (Yorkshire, Richmond): To ask the hon. Member for Chorley, as representing the First Commissioner of Works, whether his attention has been called to the unhealthy condition of many of the aged oaks in Richmond Park, and whether he will consider the desirability of removing dead limbs and branches so as to improve the appearance of the trees and prolong their existence.

(*Answered by Lord Balcarres.*) The First Commissioner is well aware of the condition of the old oaks in Richmond Park, and has already made provision in the Estimates to have the dead wood removed from some of the trees which have sufficient vigour left. Many of the trees are too old to make such treatment either useful or desirable.

Pupil Teachers.

MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE (Somersetshire, E.): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether, in view of the difficulties caused to local authorities by the present inadequate supply of teachers, he will modify the pupil teacher regulations in such a way that the engagement of boys and girls as pupil teachers at the age of fifteen may be allowed for a further period than that at present permitted in those regulations.

(*Answered by Sir William Anson.*) It has been represented to the Board of Education that their regulation requiring pupil teachers admitted on or after the 1st of August, 1904, to be not less than sixteen years of age at the date of their admission is likely to produce serious inconvenience in certain districts, owing to the difficulty of supplying immediately the additional staff which would thus be rendered necessary, and to the impossibility of provision being made by that date in those places for the full-time instruction of intending pupil teachers between the ages of fifteen and sixteen. In view of this, the Board will be prepared, where it is shown to their satisfaction that the circumstances of any area require exceptional treatment, to postpone as regards that area the date at which this regulation will come into operation until a date not later than the 1st of August, 1906, and to allow candidates between the ages of fifteen and sixteen to be admitted as pupil teachers for engagements of three years from the 1st of August, 1902, and, if necessary, also from the 1st of August, 1905.

Leith and Edinburgh Education Area.

MR. MUNRO FERGUSON (Leith Burghs): To ask the Secretary for Scotland whether, in connection with the provisions of the Education (Scotland) Bill providing a joint School Board area for Leith and Edinburgh, he would give favourable consideration to the principle of a uniform bursary system over the united area, which would include the Merchant Company and Heriot Schools.

(*Answered by Mr. A. Graham Murray.*) I do not think it expedient to discuss by way of Question and Answer the details of a Bill which will shortly be discussed in Committee; but, while I am unable to understand the exact purport of the hon. Member's Question, I am not prepared to admit that any alteration of the area of beneficiaries under existing endowments comes within the scope of the Bill.

Improved Accommodation and Precautions against Fire for Sick Poor in Workhouses.

MR. MUNRO FERGUSON: To ask the Secretary for Scotland with reference to the Report of the Departmental Committee on Poor Law Medical Relief, what steps the Local Government Board intend to take with a view to the improvement of the accommodation for the sick poor in poorhouses, especially as regards the prevention of overcrowding in the sick wards.

MR. MUNRO FERGUSON: To ask the Secretary for Scotland what steps the Local Government Board intend to take with a view to satisfy themselves that sick inmates of poorhouses are provided with sufficient means of escape in the event of an outbreak of fire, the need for which has been pointed out by the Departmental Committee on Poor Law Medical Relief.

(*Answered by Mr. A. Graham Murray.*) I would refer the hon. Member to the Answer given to-day to Questions dealing with the same subject addressed to me by the hon. Member for Berwickshire.†

Sale of Estates in County Donegal.

MR. O'DOHERTY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state how many landlords in Donegal have sold or have agreed to sell their estates under the Land Act of 1903; what are their names, and what are the valuation, rent, and purchase prices, and the number of tenants on each estate.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) An interim Return of proceedings in respect of the working of land purchase was recently laid upon the Table of the House. As at present advised I am not prepared to call for further information on the subject.

Standard Numbers for different Grades of Irish Teachers.

MR. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the National Board has yet fixed the standard numbers for the different grades of teachers; whether the numbers have been fixed by the Board or by the Treasury; whether in the latter event the Board has any power of alteration; and whether the arrangement of inter-grade teachers was invented by the Board or by the Treasury.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The standard numbers for the different grades have been fixed by the Commissioners and the Treasury. The teachers described as "inter-grade" are teachers whose average incomes for the three years ended 31st March, 1900 (exclusive of capitation grant under the Irish Education Act of 1892), did not come within the scales fixed for the various grades of teachers, but fell between the maximum rate of one grade and the minimum rate of the next higher grade. This was merely incidental to the new system of payments.

Salaries of Irish National School Teachers.

MR. MACVEAGH: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state how many first of first class national teachers who had no report higher than good received increments at the end of the last triennial period; how many having the requisite average attendance and with no reports lower than good received no increments; and whether the practice of the Board since August has been to award increments to all first of first class teachers whose incomes had been £139 or upwards, provided their average attendance was over 70 and that their reports for the preceding three years had been good or a mixture of good and fair, whilst first of first class teachers whose incomes are below £139 are for that reason denied increment, unless they receive two excellent reports for the preceding three years.

---

† See page 800.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) Teachers who were entitled to increments of good service salary by length of service, average attendance, etc., on 1st April, 1903, were granted increments if the reports on their schools for the triennial period were good. A few doubtful cases are still under consideration. First of first class masters, having incomes of £139 or over and less than £175, were recognised as in the first of first grade, and were granted increments if the reports on their schools were good and the average attendance 70. No teacher, no matter what his class or income, was refused an increment of good service salary on the ground that the reports on his school were not excellent, but teachers were not promoted to the first of first grade and the consequent increase of grade salary unless the last three reports on their schools were excellent or very good and the average attendance 70.

Police Methods in Ireland.

MR. CULLINAN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state to the House the nature of the new instructions issued and the cause for their adoption by the Royal Irish Constabulary, under which constables visit houses to ascertain information by coaxing and deception, and photograph the inhabitants; whether constables in plain clothes take snap-shots at passers-by in main thoroughfares in cities or towns; and whether officers of the force shadow the constables in their performance of those new duties.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) No instructions, such as suggested in the Question, have been issued to the Constabulary. The police do not take "snap-shots" of individuals in cities and towns, except on rare occasions where it is desirable, for police purposes, to obtain photographs of persons suspected of being concerned in crime. The reply to the concluding inquiry is in the negative.

Irish Land Purchase—Reinstatement of Evicted Tenants.

MR. CULLINAN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state the total number of applications received by the Estates Commissioners from evicted tenants; the number (in counties) who have been restored to their old holdings; the number for which substitute holdings have been provided; and the number for whom no provision has been made; and in the latter class what steps, if any, have been taken.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The interim Return of proceedings under the Land Act of 1903, brought down to 30th April last, shows that forty-seven evicted tenants had been reinstated by landlords so far as is known, and twenty-four by the Estates Commissioners. It was also stated in the Return that inquiries were being made and negotiations pending for the purchase of about 15,000 acres of untenanted land in the counties of Roscommon, Galway, Wexford, Mayo, Limerick, Fermanagh, Tipperary, and Dublin, with a view to utilise such lands for the purposes amongst others of the reinstatement of evicted tenants. The Return shows in addition that on a large number of estates, applications for advances from which had been received, the negotiations for sale were in various stages of progress. There are doubtless many evicted holdings on these estates the former tenants of which, or their representatives, have applied to the Commissioners for reinstatement. All such applications are receiving the careful consideration of the Commissioners. I am not prepared, however, as at present advised, to impose on them the preparation of additional interim Returns, which can only have the effect of impeding the working of land purchase.

Nurses for Military Stations.

SIR JOHN COLOMB (Great Yarmouth): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether any communications have been issued from the War Office containing proposals to provide military stations with a nurse trained in maternity and general nursing to attend the wives and families of soldiers without expense to them; and, if so, to whom were such communications made, and what is their general purport.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) Letters were sent to all General Officers Commanding asking for an expression of opinion as to the best means of providing nursing for the wives and families of soldiers in places where hospitals were not provided. The replies have not yet been received from all the officers concerned.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Admiralty Pensions.

SIR CARNE RASCH (Essex, Chelmsford): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether his attention has been called to the fact that in certain cases—similar to that of Mr. Fife, 21st September, 1903—Admiralty pensions are not given to applicants over sixty-five, with war service and in bad circumstances; and, if so, will he state what action he proposes to take in the matter.

THE CIVIL LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. ARTHUR LEE, Hampshire, Fareham): The Admiralty have had the case of this man under their consideration, but in view of the bad reports which have been received of his conduct, they consider that this is not a case where a special pension should be awarded. There are no applicants of sixty-five years old and more in receipt of a war medal, and who fulfil the conditions as to character and necessitous circumstances, who have not been granted a special pension.

The King's Uniform at Public Places of Entertainment.

SIR CARNE RASCH: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been called to the case of the two non-commissioned officers of the Irish Guards who were refused admission to the Gaelic Athletic Sports at Lea Bridge, Clapton, on 23rd May, having previously paid their entrance, owing to the fact of their being in the uniform of their corps; and whether he proposes to take any steps in the matter.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): I was not aware of this matter until my hon. and gallant friend drew my attention to it. If the facts are as stated, the action taken by those responsible appears to have been a gratuitous outrage of a kind which I thought was now unknown, but I trust that the publicity given to the case by this Question may render the recurrence of such an incident impossible.

GENERAL LAURIE (Pembroke and Haverfordwest): Will the right hon. Gentleman ascertain if these premises are licensed, and, if they are, will he urge the licensing magistrates to take care that the licence is withdrawn without compensation?

MR. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): Are not soldiers in uniform refused admission to English hotels, restaurants, and places of amusement?

MR. CULLINAN (Tipperary, S.): Have not the promoters of these athletic sports a perfect right to conduct them as they choose?

[No answer was returned.]

Anti-Typhoid Inoculation.

MR. EUGENE WASON (Clackmannan and Kinross): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the Committee appointed by the College of Physicians to investigate and report upon the efficacy of anti-typhoid inoculation have completed their inquiries and made their Report.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The Committee appointed by the College to consider and report on the safety and prophylactic value of Dr. A. E. Wright's anti-typhoid inoculation have made their Report. But the whole question of anti-typhoid inoculation is being considered by a body of experts.

MR. EUGENE WASON: Will the right hon. Gentleman lay the Report on the Table?

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I will consider that when I have received the final Report.

Mr. EUGENE WASON: Cannot we have the interim Report?

*Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER: It is not an interim Report; it is only a Report by one part of the Committee.

Mr. EUGENE WASON: Well, can we see that?

*Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER: No, Sir.

Army Corps.

Colonel NOLAN (Galway, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he will state how many Army Corps are there in Great Britain and Ireland.

*Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER: There are four Commands which are described as Army Corps, the head-quarters of which are situated at Aldershot, Salisbury, Dublin, and London.

Mr. CHARLES HOBHOUSE (Bristol, E.): Has the Report of the Departmental Committee been presented?

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! That hardly arises out of the Question.

Volunteers—Cost of Training.

Mr. LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Molton): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, what would be the additional annual cost to be defrayed by the State so that no Volunteer should be out of pocket in consequence of his endeavour to train himself as a soldier.

*Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I am afraid that there are no statistics available from which it would be possible to calculate the cost to the State of providing for the out-of-pocket expenditure of the Volunteer over and above the public grants which are calculated to meet such expenses as are absolutely necessary in order that the average man may become efficient.

Mr. LAMBERT: Can the right hon. Gentleman give an approximate estimate?

*Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER: No, Sir. I have taken some pains to inquire and find so many items of expenditure are undertaken by officers in pursuance of their own ideas of duty, and they vary so much, that I cannot give even an approximate estimate.

Shambles Barracks, Galway.

Mr. CHARLES DEVLIN (Galway): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that an old building, known as the Shambles Barracks of Galway, has been condemned long since; and that, in consequence of this condemned building extending into the street, congestion of traffic occurs; and, if so, will he say what action he proposes taking in the matter.

*Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER: It was decided to dispose of these barracks, but owing to the pressure during the South African War it was found necessary to occupy them. It will not be possible to dispose of them until accommodation can be found elsewhere for the present occupants.

Commissioners of Mines and Railways in the Transvaal.

Mr. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies by whom the positions of Commissioner of Railways and Commissioner of Mines in the Transvaal are now filled; how long they have occupied the posts; what is the salary in each case; and what has been the previous experience and career of the Commissioners.

The SECRETARY of STATE for the COLONIES (Mr. Lyttelton, Warwick and Leamington): Sir P. Girouard is Commissioner of Railways. His salary has been fixed at £2,500 with a personal allowance of £1,000 in addition. During the war he occupied the post of Director of Military Railways and has held his present position since the railways were handed over to the Civil Government. He is a Royal Engineer officer who rendered very distinguished service in connection with the construction of railways in the Soudan War. Mr. Horace Weldon is acting in the appointment of Commissioner of Mines, the salary of which is £2,000. I am not aware whether he draws a personal allowance. He was educated at the

Royal School of Mines in London and has had mining experience in the Isle of Man, the Lancashire Hematite Mines and the Rand Mines, where he went in 1893, working first as a miner and later as manager of several companies till war broke out, when he served in one of the Irregular Corps and in the Field Intelligence Department on General Buller's Staff. He was appointed Government Mining Engineer in 1901.

Selukwe Gold Mines—Native Mortality.

Mr. HERBERT SAMUEL (Yorkshire, Cleveland): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he will state what is the latest return of the death rate of the natives employed in the Selukwe gold mines in Rhodesia.

Mr. LYTTELTON: I am informed that during the four months ending 31st March, 1904, thirteen deaths occurred among natives employed in the mines in the Selukwe district; the average number employed during the period was 1,902.

Mr. TREVELYAN (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland): Can the right hon. Gentleman say when the Report on mortality both in the Transvaal and Rhodesia will be presented?

Mr. LYTTELTON: I cannot. My impression is that we only this morning received information which will enable us to complete it.

Native Labour in the Transvaal.

Sir JOHN GORST (Cambridge University): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies what is the latest date in 1904 at which natives from British Central Africa have been brought into the Transvaal to work in the mines; whether any period has been specifically fixed during the Transvaal winter by either the British or Transvaal Government within which the introduction of British South African natives into the Transvaal will in future years be prohibited; and whether a separate account will be kept and laid before Parliament of the mortality amongst British South African natives employed in the Transvaal mines.

Mr. LYTTELTON: I understand that none have so far been introduced in 1904. Their arrival is not to take place until August, as the right hon. Member will see on reference to page 35 of Cd. 1950. The local authorities are all agreed that these natives should not in future be brought to the Rand in winter. A separate account will be kept and published. The mortality up to the present is shown by the statements on page 33 of Cd. 1950 and page 153 of Cd. 2025. The mortality of the first six weeks among these natives was altogether exceptional.

Chinese Labour in Southern Rhodesia.

Mr. HERBERT SAMUEL: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the Legislative Council of Southern Rhodesia has, in its present session, passed any resolution on the subject of the importation of Chinese labour into that territory; and, if so, whether he will state what were the terms of the resolution, and how many of the elected members voted for and against.

Mr. LYTTELTON: I am not aware that any resolution on the subject has been passed as yet.

Mr. HERBERT SAMUEL: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, in view of the difference in the conditions in the Transvaal and of Rhodesia, an opportunity for discussion in this House will be afforded before he sanctions the importation into Rhodesia of Chinese indentured labour.

The PRIME MINISTER and FIRST LORD of the TREASURY (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.): I think I have already answered the same hon. Gentleman on this very Question. The Answer I gave was this. I did not understand that any question of principle was raised by the introduction of Asiatic labour into Rhodesia which was not equally raised in connection with the same policy in the Transvaal, and in these circumstances I did not think a separate discussion on Rhodesia necessary or desirable. I think that Answer still holds good.

MR. TREVELYAN: Is not some difference to be found in the fact that Lord Milner was in favour of the introduction of Asiatic labour, whereas Sir Marshal Clarke was opposed to it?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: If the hon. Gentleman wants me to get at facts he must give me notice; but if he wants an answer at once, I should say that difference of opinion between these high officials, if it exists to the extent the hon. Gentleman represents, does not amount to a difference in principle as to the question of the employment of yellow labour which would require separate discussion in this House.

MR. MARKHAM (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield) also put a further Question which was not quite audible, suggesting that there was a substantial difference between the cases of Rhodesia and the Transvaal by reason of the fact that the Council in one case was nominated by Lord Milner.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not deny that there is a difference and an important difference; but it is not a difference of importance relative to the large issues which have been, rightly or wrongly—wrongly as I think—attached to this question of Chinese labour.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): Are we to understand that yellow labour, as the right hon. Gentleman calls it, can be introduced into any part of the Empire without any discussion or notice in this House?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not think the right hon. Gentleman can draw that inference, and certainly he ought not to do so.

The Mission to Tibet.

MR. LAMBERT: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he can give an approximate date when the force now at Gyangtse will be ready to commence its advance to Lhasa; and whether there is any evidence that the refusal of the Tibetans to negotiate is due to Russian influence.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): Until the actual date has been fixed, it would not be in the public interest to make any statement as to the day on which the force will advance. As regards the second part of the Question, I must refer the hon. Member to the information contained in the Blue-book.

Competition for Government Appointments in India.

COLONEL NOLAN: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India if he can at length state to what extent competition for Government appointments has been abolished or diminished in India; if the abolition of competitive examination for official appointment is applied to natives of the country only, or if it in any case extends to official appointments sometimes held by Europeans; if he will specify what classes of appointments have been abstracted from competitive entrance; also, if he will state who will now enjoy the patronage which will be created by the partial abolition of competition.

MR. BRODRICK: Open competition for Government appointments has been abolished to the extent of three appointments annually to the Provincial Executive Service in the United Provinces and in Bombay, also in the case of the small proportion of appointments in the executive branch of the Provincial Service, which is filled by recruitment and not by promotion from the subordinate service. As regards appointments in the other provinces the Government of India are in correspondence with local Governments, and further deliberation is necessary before any orders can be issued. The change, as stated in my reply to the hon. Member on the 16th March†, relates exclusively to appointments made in India, which are ordinarily held by natives of the country. The class of appointments affected by the orders issued in Bombay and the United Provinces is the executive branch of the Provincial Service. The duty of making appointments to this service will rest where it has always rested, that is, with the local Government.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxxxi., 1251.

Massacres in the Sasun District.

Mr. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he can give the House any information regarding the destruction of villages and slaughter of peasantry which has recently been perpetrated by Turkish troops and Kurds in the Sasun district and elsewhere in the neighbourhood of Bitlis and Van; and what action, if any, His Majesty's Government and other European Powers are taking in the matter with a view to the stopping of this bloodshed and devastation and the prevention of similar acts in the future.

The UNDER-SECRETARY of STATE for FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Earl Percy, Kensington, S.): According to the reports received by His Majesty's Government, twelve villages have been burnt or destroyed in the Sandjak of Moush and thirteen in the Sandjak of Guendj, but it is not clear whether the destruction was caused by the insurgents or by the Turkish troops. There seems reason to hope that the loss of life has been comparatively small. His Majesty's Ambassador has from the beginning repeatedly represented to the Ottoman Government the gravity of the situation and has urged upon the Sultan the expediency of endeavouring to negotiate peaceably with the insurgents. The Turkish Government accepted a proposal made by Sir Nicholas O'Conor that the Consuls of Great Britain, France, and Russia should act as intermediaries, and the French and British Consuls have been at Moush since the middle of last month, awaiting the arrival of the Russian Consul, who was delayed at Tiflis. It is difficult for these officers to enter at present into negotiations with the bands, which are now scattered and disorganised, but there is no doubt that their presence has exercised a beneficial effect. They have been instructed to remain at Moush until they are assured that there is no likelihood of a fresh insurrectionary movement and of renewed military action.

Mr. BRYCE: Can the noble Lord give the House any Papers on the subject?

Earl PERCY: There are hardly any to be laid.

Mr. BRYCE: You have the reports?

Earl PERCY: Not in detail.

Employment of Children Act By-Laws.

Mr. TENNANT (Berwickshire): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department what has been done with regard to sanctioning by-laws under the Employment of Children Act, 1903; and whether he can state how many and what local authorities will prohibit street trading by girls under sixteen.

***The SECRETARY of STATE for the HOME DEPARTMENT** (Mr. Akers-Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's): One set of by-laws under the Employment of Children Act has been confirmed and is now in force; viz., for the Borough of Warrington. Under this set, street-trading is absolutely prohibited in the case of girls under fourteen and partially (*i.e.* as regards certain places) in the case of girls between fourteen and sixteen. By-laws have also been provisionally approved for Hull, where there is to be a partial prohibition for girls under sixteen, and for Burnley, Todmorden and Swindon, where the prohibition is to be absolute. Proposals from seven other places for the restriction or prohibition of such street trading are now under consideration.

Mr. TENNANT: Are these the only places where they have been approved?

***Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS**: I have given the whole list.

The Post Office and the National Telephone Company.

Mr. LOUGH (Islington, W.): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether his negotiations with the National Telephone Company for the purchase of their system are yet completed; and whether he intends to give notice to terminate their licence at the end of this year; and what steps he intends to take to bring the arrangements before Parliament in accordance with his undertaking.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westhoughton): The negotiations with the National Telephone Company on the subject of the purchase of their system are not concluded, and while they are still in progress the hon. Member will hardly expect me to make any declaration of the intentions of the Government as to terminating the Company's licence by notice. The hon. Member's last Question seems somewhat premature. I can only assure him that if an arrangement is come to I have every attention of fulfilling my promise to bring it before Parliament for approval.

MR. LOUGH: Is it not the case that the negotiations must be concluded this month if the necessary notice is to be given?

LORD STANLEY: If the notice is to be given.

Cycle Allowance to Telegraph Linemen.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that instructions have recently been issued by the superintending engineer to discontinue the allowance of 2d. per mile to linemen who use their own cycles for tracing line faults when trains or other conveyances are not available, and which allowance was sanctioned by the Postmaster-General about May, 1903; and, if so, whether he will see that this allowance is continued.

LORD STANLEY: I am unable to trace the issue of any such instructions. Perhaps the hon. Member will be so good as to inform me by which of the superintending engineers he believes them to have been issued.

Books of Postage Stamps.

MR. EUGENE WASON: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether, having regard to the convenience to the public in being able to buy a book of twenty-four penny stamps for 2s. 0½d., he could give instructions that books of forty-eight halfpenny stamps could be supplied at the same price.

LORD STANLEY: I doubt whether there would be much public demand for books of forty-eight halfpenny stamps, but I am considering a proposal to issue books of penny and halfpenny stamps combined.

Canadian Duty on Woollen Goods.

MR. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydvil): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if the Canadian Government have decided to raise the duty on imported woollen goods to 45 per cent. *ad valorem*; and if he can say how the rate of duty imposed on woollen manufactures imported from this country, after allowing for the 33⅓ per cent. rebate, compares with that imposed in 1896 and in subsequent years.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): I have no information as to any decision by the Canadian Government to alter the duty on woollen goods. If the hon. Member will put down an unstarred Question asking for the information referred to in the second part of his Question to-day, I shall be happy to supply it. It cannot be conveniently given in reply to an oral Question.

Report of Committee on Duties of Board of Trade and Local Government Board.

MR. D. A. THOMAS: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he can now state when the Report of the Committee appointed to consider the position and duties of the Board of Trade and Local Government Board is likely to be in the hands of Members.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): I propose to lay this Report at once.

New Education Code—Changed System of Grants.

SIR JOHN DORINGTON (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether, in view of the fact that under the system of grants set out in Article 31 of the new Code there would be a gain of one shilling on any child attending school continuously from the age of three to fifteen, but that if a child leaves school, as is commonly the case, at the age of thirteen, there would be a loss of five shillings on that child; and, in view of the financial loss thus involved to local authorities, the Board of Education will withdraw Article 31 of the new Code and substitute for it Articles 98 and 101 (a) of the existing Code for another year, so as to enable the financial results of the proposed change to be fully considered.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir WILLIAM ANSON, Oxford University): I am not prepared to accept the representation of the effect of the new grant given in the Question as accurate. Statistics show that the age at which a child begins to attend school is, in fact, nearer four than three. Again, the hon. Member has assumed that the average age at which a child ceases to be paid for as an infant is seven; the age is, in fact, about seven and a half. Both these facts tend to vitiate the argument underlying the allegation in the Question. It must further be remembered that any loss of the kind suggested in the Question is not an annual one, but is spread over a period of ten years, and is very small compared with the total amount of the grant earned during the period. The Board estimate that if a child comes to school at three and stops until fifteen, it will earn 3s. 6d. more than was possible before, assuming that it was paid for as an infant until seven and a half. If a child attends from four to thirteen, there would be a loss of only 6d., spread over a period of ten years, as against the 5s. annually which the Question might imply.

SIR JOHN DORINGTON: Will there not be a very considerable loss to the local authorities?

SIR WILLIAM ANSON: No, Sir. I think my Answer tends to show that there will not be a considerable loss at all, and that in some cases there will be a considerable gain.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY (Somersetshire, S.): Will the hon. Gentleman undertake that the Question shall be discussed before the Code comes in force?

SIR WILLIAM ANSON: An opportunity of discussing the new Code will be available. It does not come into force until the 1st August.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: It has to lay on the Table thirty days, and that period has already nearly expired.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON: I can assure the hon. Member there will be ample opportunity of discussing it before it comes into operation.

Pauper Children and Pauper Nursing in Scotland.

MR. TENNANT: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland, with reference to the recommendation contained in the Report of the Departmental Committee on Poor Law Medical Relief, whether the Local Government Board have considered the advisability of holding an inquiry into the system of boarding out pauper children in Scotland; and, if so, whether they will appoint a Committee

MR. TENNANT: I beg also to ask the Secretary for Scotland if he intends to introduce a Bill to empower the Local Government Board to prohibit pauper nursing in Scottish poorhouses, as has been recommended by the Departmental Committee on Poor Law Medical Relief.

THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. SCOTT DICKSON, Glasgow, Bridgton): The Local Government Board are at present considering the Report of the Departmental Committee on Poor Law Medical Relief with a view (1) to have effect given to such of the recommendations as appear advisable and do not require legislation, and (2) to propose legislation in so far as that may be necessary.

MR. TENNANT: Can the hon. Gentleman say whether the matters I have mentioned come under the first category or the second?

MR. SCOTT DICKSON: I must ask for notice of that.

MR. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): Will legislation be proposed this session?

MR. SCOTT DICKSON: It is impossible for me to say.

Lord Longford's Westmeath Estate.

MR. SULLIVAN (Westmeath, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether Lord Longford's estate, in the county of Westmeath, or portions of it, has been sold to the occupying tenants; and, if so, upon what terms; whether he is aware that Andrew Caddell, of Gneevebawn, an evicted tenant, applied, through his parish priest, to be reinstated on his former holding, but was refused, and that on his application to the Estates Commissioners beseeching their interest to have him restored to his old farm, as it is unoccupied, the Commissioners declined to give any satisfactory reply; and, if so, will he state upon what grounds they base their refusal.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): There are no proceedings pending for the sale of any portion of this estate. An application for reinstatement has been received from Andrew Caddell. The Commissioners did not refuse the application; they stated it would be considered.

Land Purchase in County Down.

MR. MACVEAGH: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the names of those landlords in county Down who have agreed to sell out under the Land Act, the number of tenants in each case, and the total numbers of landlords and of tenants in the county.

MR. WYNDHAM: I have no information as to the number of landlords or tenants in any particular county. I am not prepared—as at present advised—to call for further information than is contained in the Return on the Working of Land Purchase now in hon. Members' hands. The compilation of that Return imposed a serious tax on the Estates Commissioners' staff, whose time is more than occupied by the volume of work now coming into their Department.

Kilbride Camp Canteen.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to statements made by Mr. Fletcher Moore, D.L., when presiding at Blessington Petty Sessions; on the 16th of May, to the effect that the Blessington magistrates had on the 4th of April refused to grant a licence to the canteen at the Kilbride Camp, county Wicklow, on grounds considered by the magistrates to be adequate and reasonable, and that subsequently the order for the licence was signed and granted by two magistrates, namely, Sir Henry Cochrane, who resides in Bray, a long way outside the Blessington district, and by Mr. James Shanks, who is not a magistrate for the county Wicklow; and, if so, will he say what action does he intend to take in the matter.

MR. WYNDHAM: The issue of a canteen licence is regulated by Section 174 of the Army Act, 1881, which provides that it may be granted by any two justices of the peace "within their respective jurisdictions." I am advised that each of the two justices who sign the order granting a canteen licence must be a justice for, and have jurisdiction in, the county in which it is intended to hold the canteen. In the present instance, one of the two gentlemen who signed the order was not so qualified, and the order made was, in the circumstances, invalid. I have so informed my right hon. friend the Secretary of State for War.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR: Have either or both of these gentlemen been in the habit of supplying mineral waters to the camp?

MR. WYNDHAM: I have no information on that point.

*__MR. CULLINAN__: Is it not the case that under similar circumstances some years ago Mr. James Byrne, of Wallstown Castle, county Cork, was deprived of the commission of the peace for signing a licence outside his district?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! notice must be given of that.

Earl Fitzwilliam and his Tenants.

Mr. JAMES O'CONNOR: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware (1) that a number of ejectment processes at the instance of Earl Fitzwilliam were recently heard at the Tinahely Petty Sessions; can he say (2) how many decrees were granted by the Court, and (3) for how many years rent due; (4) can he state how many of the tenants decreed had refused to accept the landlord's terms of sale; (5) and how many of the tenants, on receipt of ejectment notices, consented to purchase their holdings at the landlord's price.

Mr. WYNDHAM: On Friday last I communicated to the hon. Member the information desired in the first three queries. I have no official information on the other matters referred to. Unofficially I have been informed that there has been no departure from the practice observed on this estate.

Mr. JAMES O'CONNOR: Will the right hon. Gentleman call the attention of the Estates Commissioners to the action of the landlords in forcing the tenants to buy at their prices by serving ejectment notices on them for arrears of rent?

Mr. WYNDHAM: I have no information that that is so.

Wreck in Galway Mill Stream.

Mr. CHARLES DEVLIN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the wreck of an old boat or dredger, belonging to the Board of Works, has been left in the mill stream at Galway, obstructing it; and, if so, will he say when the Board of Works propose removing this wreckage.

The FINANCIAL SECRETARY of the TREASURY (Mr. Victor Cavendish, Derbyshire, W.): The Board of Works inform me that there is no wreck of an old boat or dredger belonging to them in the mill stream at Galway.

Galway Drainage.

Colonel NOLAN; I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if there are any reports in the Board of Works concerning the drainage or want of drainage of the Milltown River, county Galway, and of the Dunmore district; and, if there are no such reports, would the Board of Works send an engineer to report on the drainage of those districts.

Mr. VICTOR CAVENDISH: The Board of Works has all the information upon the drainage of this district. It would not be usual to make an inspection of a drainage district in the absence of a complaint that the trustees have neglected their duties.

International Law of Warfare.

Mr. LAWSON WALTON (Leeds, S.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether any representations have been made to the Russian Government in reference to their proclamation declaratory of contraband of war, particularly in regard to food and cotton, to the use of neutral ports for the coaling of warships for belligerent operations or as a naval base, or to the alleged setting of explosive mines outside territorial waters, or in reference to any of the above subjects; and, if so, will he direct that copies of these communications be furnished to Members of this House.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: The present war certainly has raised questions of novelty, and I think some difficulty in connection with international law. The whole subject is being most anxiously reviewed by His Majesty's Government, but I do not think that at this moment any public object would be gained by the publication of any communications we have made or indeed by any premature statement on the subject.

Conscription.

Sir HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he has any announcement to make as to the view of His Majesty's Government concerning the opinion expressed in the Report of the Royal Commission on Militia and Volunteers that although these forces now voluntarily provide 20 per cent. more men than are authoritatively estimated to be necessary for land defence against an invader, compulsory service of the whole male population for one year with the colours is desirable.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I think this Question has already been answered by the Secretary for War in perfectly specific terms. To that answer I have really nothing to add. We do not agree, of course, with the recommendation.

State Registration of Nurses.

MR. TENNANT: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he is now prepared to set up the Select Committee on Nursing and the State Registration of Nurses, and to state what will be the reference to the Committee.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I hope the Committee may be set down shortly. I do not think there ought to be any difficulty with regard to the reference, but I am not in a position as yet to state it to the House. I do not know whether it is worth while adding that there are two Bills now before the House dealing with the subject, which, if the House were content to read them formally a second time, might be referred to the Committee.

MR. TENNANT: Do I understand that the Government would assist private Members—that they would not put any obstacle in their way?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: They would not put any obstacle in their way, but I do not think I could promise Government time.

Defence of the United Kingdom.

MR. LAMBERT: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether the Committee of Imperial Defence have arrived at an authoritative decision as to the force which should be maintained for the defence of the United Kingdom; if so, is there any objection to stating their decision.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not think it would be desirable—I had almost said possible—to discuss questions of Imperial defence by Question and Answer across the Table of the House. This particular Question, as the hon. Gentleman will see, requires a whole speech to answer it, and I do not think the House would tolerate, at all events on this occasion, a speech from me on the subject.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Has the right hon. Gentleman any statement to make as to the course of the business?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It is proposed to continue the discussion on the Licensing Bill on Tuesday and Wednesday. As, however, the Aliens Bill was not referred to a Committee on Friday last, it is proposed to take that Motion first on Wednesday. I also propose to take the reference of the Penal Servitude Bill, to which I imagine there will be no opposition.

An **HON. MEMBER**: In what order?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The Bills will be taken in the following order:—The Aliens Bill, the Penal Servitude Bill, and the Licensing Bill. On Thursday I intend to put down the Foreign Office Vote. Friday is a day allocated to private Members.

MEMBERS AND THE CHAIRMAN.

MR. MARKHAM: I desire, Sir, to call your attention to the fact that I was in the House on Thursday last, and that my name is not recorded in the list of Members who disagreed with the decision of the Chairman. I only received the Votes and Proceedings by post, and could not raise the question before.

***MR. SPEAKER**: I understood that the hon. Member made a statement to the House, when asked if he stood up, that he stood at the Bar.

MR. MARKHAM: No, Sir, I said I stood up in my place, but was at the time on the Third Bench on the other side of the House, and the Clerk said that was sufficient to disqualify me from having my vote recorded.

***MR. SPEAKER**: The hon. Gentleman's memory differs from that of the Clerk at the Table, but I will give instructions to have his name inserted.

THE NEW EDUCATION CODE.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY (Somersetshire, S.) asked for leave to move the adjournment of the House in order to discuss a definite matter of urgent public importance—namely, "the heavy additional charge which will fall on the local rates if the alterations made in the grant for public elementary education by Article 31 of the new Code for the regulation of public elementary schools are allowed to come into force as they are now proposed."

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member was good enough to show me his proposal. At first I understood that the Article was coming into force on the 13th of this month, and that it would be too late to bring the matter under the notice of the Government unless there was a discussion before that date. I understand now that it does not come into force until 1st August, and that the Secretary to the Board of Education has undertaken that there will be an opportunity of discussing it on the Estimates. In these circumstances I cannot say now that this is a matter of urgent public importance. It seems to me a matter which would fall under a general discussion of educational policy.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: My point is that there will be no opportunity of discussing the matter under Section 97 of the Act of 1870, under which the Code has to lie for forty days on the Table of the House.

*MR. SPEAKER: That is merely a question of the operation of the Twelve O'clock Rule. In this particular case a Motion for an Address to the Crown could not be taken after midnight if objected to, but that does not affect urgency.

NEW WRIT.

New Writ for the county of Leicester (South or Harborough Division), in the room of John William Logan, esquire (Manor of Northstead).—(*Mr. Robert Spencer.*)

NEW BILLS.

SHIPOWNERS' NEGLIGENCE (REMEDIES) BILL.

"To enlarge the remedies of persons injured by the negligence of Shipowners," presented by Sir Harry Samuel; supported by Mr. Brynmor Jones, Sir Ernest Flower, Mr. Sydney Buxton, and Mr. Bell; to be read a second time upon Monday, 20th June, and to be printed. [Bill 220.]

COUNTY COURTS (ADMIRALTY JURISDICTION) BILL.

"To amend the County Courts (Admiralty Jurisdiction) Acts by giving powers of arrest of foreign ships in cases of personal injury to British workmen and others on board any such ship," presented by Sir Albert Rollit; supported by Sir James Woodhouse; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, and to be printed. [Bill 221.]

MUNICIPAL FRANCHISE (COMPANIES) BILL.

"To confer the Municipal Franchise upon mercantile corporations and companies," presented by Sir Albert Rollit; supported by Sir Fortescue Flannery, Mr. H. C. Richards, Sir William Holland, and Mr. Howard; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, and to be printed. [Bill 222.]

LICENSING BILL.

On the Order for going into Committee on this Bill.

*MR. SPEAKER: As to the Instructions to the Committee standing on the Paper, the first, which stands in the name of the hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil, is to give the Committee power to divide the Bill into two Bills, the one to deal with the limitation of the jurisdiction of local magistrates, and the other with the provisions for compensation. That is out of order because it is not competent to an hon. Member to move an Instruction of that kind unless the Bill is actually divided into two separate parts, or the two matters are independent of one another and fall naturally into separate Bills. That is not the case here. The next Instruction, in the name of the hon. Member for West

Nottingham, proposes that the Committee should have power to differentiate on the amount and mode of compensation payable in the case of what are known as tied houses. It seems to me quite competent for the Committee to deal with that matter by way of Amendment to the Bill, and, therefore, an Instruction is not required. The same remark applies to the next two Instructions, one standing in the name of the hon. Member for Anglesey to exclude Wales and Monmouthshire from the Bill, and the other in the name of the hon. Member for Spen Valley. That Instruction, which calls on the Committee to provide that the issue of licences shall not be confined to selected and favoured persons to the exclusion of others equally qualified and equally willing to comply with the conditions and regulations, appears to me to be bad for another reason, and that is that it is altogether too vague and indefinite and does not direct the Committee as to the precise object the hon. Member has in view.

(Considered in Committee.)

(In the Committee.)

[MR. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 1:—

*MR. WHITTAKER (Yorkshire, W. R., Spen Valley) said that in rising to move the postponement of Clause 1, he did so on the ground that that clause proposed a very important change in the administration of the licensing law which, according to the statement of Ministers of the Crown, was rendered necessary by the shape in which the compensation clauses had been drawn. It was quite possible, in view of the large number of Amendments there were upon the Paper to the compensation clauses, that they might be amended in such a way that it would not be necessary to make the sweeping and important changes in the jurisdiction of local justices which the passing of this clause would entail. The Bill, as he understood it, was in principle a Compensation Bill. Compensation was its main principle, and he imagined that hon. Members who voted for it did so chiefly on the ground that it was a Compensation Bill. That portion of the Bill which interfered with the discretion of the justices was merely an incident. It seemed to him extremely desirable that they should settle the method and plan of compensation before they proposed to do so important a thing as to alter the discretionary powers of the justices, because they might get some particular kind of compensation carried which would entirely alter the method which the Bill at present proposed. He would venture to quote in support of that the words uttered by the hon. and learned Gentleman, the Solicitor-General, on the Second Reading of the measure. He then said—

> "The whole difficulty in framing the Bill in regard to the renewal of licences has been to define what is the proper compensation area. The Bill has no intention whatever of taking away any power whatever from the magistrates which they already have."

He regretted that this clause did not bear out that statement, but the hon. and learned Gentleman went on to say that it would be necessary to have a compensation area so large that it would be able to raise sufficient revenue for the purpose of extinguishing licences. Was not that an interference with the present tribunal? The Prime Minister made a similar statement, and therefore it was clear that the sole reason for interfering with the discretion of the justices was that the quarter sessions area had been selected as the compensation area. If they decided to have some other area, then it would not be necessary to make the very serious interference with the authority of the licensing justices which was proposed in the clause. Other arrangements might render Clause 1 altogether needless, and therefore the suggestion was justified that the clause should be postponed until they had discussed the compensation area. The contention in regard to compensation was that the area must be a large one because sufficient funds could not be raised without it, and that the authority which dealt with questions of licences must be the authority throughout that area. The levy must decide what was to be the licensing authority, and he submitted that that question had been entirely overlooked. Another point was whether the levy to be made for compensation purposes was to be a limited one. If they made it unlimited then they need not touch the licensing authority.

and they need not pass Clause 1 at all but could allow the licensing authority to remain as it at present stood. He submitted that the sound principle was that the levy should depend upon the reduction, and that the reduction should not depend upon the levy. The whole necessity for that most undesirable and objectionable clause arose from the fact that they had provided for a limited levy. When they came to the compensation clause they had this simple thing to do, to make the levy unlimited, and they would thus avoid any necessity for Clause 1 on that ground. That was why he suggested its postponement.

It was well known that one of the most important subjects that would come up for discussion on this Bill was in connection with the question of a time limit, involving the point whether the compensation arrangement was to be temporary or permanent. He suggested that if the House should decide that the compensation should be a temporary arrangement, by adopting a time limit, it was undesirable that they should make a permanent change in the character and power of the licensing authority. They ought not to take away for all time the valuable discretion which the local justices now possessed simply to meet the temporary arrangement which he hoped it was quite within the bounds of possibility they would agree to make in regard to this compensation question. That, again, was another reason why they should postpone the consideration of the clause. The clause was an important one. It represented an entire revolution in the procedure and tendency of legislation. They had never had anything like it before, and that was a strong reason why no change should be made unless it was absolutely necessary and absolutely essential. The necessity for the change depended entirely upon the compensation arrangement, and they could not declare it to be essential until they had decided what those arrangements should be. He should like to remind the House that it was proposed to transfer from the local justices to quarter sessions their powers, and to practically turn an administrative authority into a Court. It practically deprived the justices of the powers which the recent decisions in the Dover and Farnham cases had shown they were justified in exercising.

*THE CHAIRMAN: Order, order! The hon. Member is now proceeding to discuss the clause in detail. He must confine himself to giving reasons for the postponement.

*MR. WHITTAKER said his object was to point out the serious nature of the change which was projected, and to justify on that ground his contention that they should delay the consideration of the clause. He quite admitted that under the limitation of the rulings from the Chair he could not pursue in detail these matters, and therefore he would content himself with the question of principle. He would point out that this was a most serious change in the administrative powers of local justices which ought not to be made if it could be avoided, and unless it was admittedly rendered necessary by the scheme of compensation embodied in the Bill. He appealed to the House to settle the question of compensation before they proceeded to deal with the machinery for carrying it into effect.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Clause 1 be postponed."—(*Mr. Whittaker.*)

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (MR AKERS-DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's) could not agree with the hon. Member that it was desirable to postpone the discussion of this clause. It had always been held to be a good thing to have the principle on which a Bill was founded as near to the beginning of the Bill as possible. The principle on which this Bill and all its clauses depended was contained in the first clause, which set up the authority and also established compensation. It provided that licences should not be taken away on any ground other than that the licensed premises had been ill-conducted or were structurally deficient or unsuitable, or on grounds connected with the character or fitness of the proposed holder of the licence, except on payment of compensation. There they had the principle on which the Bill was founded, and therefore he thought it was perfectly right that this clause should stand first in the Bill, and that the Committee, having disposed of it, should know where they were when they considered the other clauses. He, therefore, saw no reason for accepting the Amendment.

MR. ELLIS GRIFFITH (Anglesey) said the right hon. Gentleman, according to his mind, had accurately stated the argument upon which the supporters of the Amendment relied, but unfortunately for him it was the case that Clause 1 dealt with the machinery, and Clause 2 embodied the principle of the Bill. If the Solicitor-General would only look at Clause 2 he would find that the question of compensation for the non-renewal of licences was the main point raised by it. It was quite true that the same point was incidentally mentioned in Clause 1, but, under any circumstances, in Clause 2 it would be necessary for them to discuss the principle of compensation or no compensation. His submission to the Committee was that the Bill consisted of two clauses, the first of which embodied the machinery, and the second the principle of the Bill, and that it would be far more convenient and more suitable for discussion if the first clause were postponed until after the second had been dealt with. The Solicitor-General would no doubt remember that, in the course of the Second Reading debate, he had held out some hope that courts of quarter sessions would not be courts within the technical meaning of the word, but that they would become administrative bodies. Surely it would be useful if they could be informed what was to occur in connection with that. They wanted to know what were to be the provisions of the Bill as to compensation before they could deal with the machinery which was to administer that compensation. The hon. and learned Gentleman also gave them some hope that a time limit might be accepted by the Government. The Solicitor-General shook his head. Well, perhaps the hon. and learned Gentleman had changed his mind, and in that he did not differ very much from other members of the Government. Still he did hope that the Government would keep an open mind on this question. Whether or not they had, he submitted it would be for the convenience of the House, and that it would conduce to the speedy passing of the Bill if Ministers would accept the Amendment postponing the first clause. When they had settled the questions of compensation and of area, then it would be sufficient time to deal with that of machinery.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs) said he regretted that the Government could not see their way to postpone the consideration of the first clause. What they really wanted to know was, What was the attitude of the Government going to be on the question of compensation, and on the question, also, of the time limit? Because that would decide the attitude of the House in regard to questions of relatively minor importance. As his hon. friend the Member for the Spen Valley had said, if the question of compensation were settled, and if the Government adhered to their present position, the first clause became more or less immaterial. It would be simply an additional protection in the brewers' interest. On the other hand, if the Government acceded to the views of those who were in favour of a time limit, they would find the House in a less controversial frame of mind when it came to discuss the question of procedure. He had another point to raise. He held that the Government, in a thing of this sort affecting the magistrates' discretion, should take an opportunity of consulting the magistrates themselves in regard to their proposals. [MINISTERIAL cries of "No, No!"] Hon. Gentlemen opposite seemed to think it ridiculous that the Government should consult anyone except the brewers. He could not, however, help thinking that in a matter of this kind it was only fair that the magistrates should be consulted, and in view of the fact that within the next three weeks the Courts of quarter sessions would be sitting, and that by that time they would only have got through the second and third clauses, he held there was ample opportunity for the Government to ascertain the opinions of the magistrates in regard to the first clause of the Bill. He hoped, therefore, that steps would be taken to secure that information.

Sir ROBERT REID (Dumfries Burghs) said he could quite understand the desire of the Government that the first clause should be taken at once if that clause were intended to provide some additional security to those who had property in public-houses. If the transfer of jurisdiction to quarter sessions were intended to bestow on owners of licensed property a more favourable tribunal and one less likely to interfere with their interests than the existing one, then anyone could easily see that that was a substantial reason in itself for supporting the proposal of the Government in its present form. But on the Second Reading that was not represented to be the purpose of the transfer of jurisdiction. The purpose was to harmonise the jurisdiction with the system of compensation by counties. If a different system of compensation should be adopted by the Committee, there would be no necessity for altering the jurisdiction and allowing quarter sessions to usurp the jurisdiction of the local justices. The fact that the first clause merely provided the method by which the compensation should be distributed seemed to be an adequate reason for postponing it.

Mr. HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.) said his hon. friend who moved the Amendment had already given most of the important reasons in favour of postponing the consideration of the clause. There was, however, one point to which he had not referred, and that was that the Bill, as it at present stood, did not appear to make the levy compulsory, and therefore they might have the magistrates of the different counties exercising their discretionary powers in different manners. It seemed to him that before they could decide their attitude on the first clause they must know the views of the Government as to the conditions which were to regulate the compensation fund, and he hoped, especially in regard to the most important question of the time limit, that they would have the views of the Solicitor-General before the Amendment was put to the vote.

Mr. McKENNA (Monmouthshire, N.) said he would take his stand on the case set up by the Solicitor-General. If Clause 1 were passed as it stood, they might have the compensation under Clause 2 varying from one year to ten years or even twenty years, and they might have a variation also in the areas. But supposing that, under Clause 2, they established a time limit for compensation, what was to be done in regard to the change in the jurisdiction of the licensing authority? Was that change to be permanent? Why should it be permanent when the compensation proposal was only of a temporary character. It must be obvious that, if they were to proceed on the lines laid down by the Home Secretary, they must establish the main principle of the Bill, and that main principle was compensation for the withdrawal of licences on grounds other than those specified under Clause 1. Until that principle was established they could not decide whether the compensation should be permanent or temporary, they could not decide either what should be the area, whether it should be divisional, or county, or local, and how could they reasonably be asked to set up the machinery in Clause 1 until they knew what would be done in these matters. He was not particularly in favour of the quick passage of the measure, but he warned the Government that if they did desire to get it passed they must make plain their views on these questions. There were a considerable number of Amendments down to Clause 2, and it was absolutely essential to get a decision in regard to them before they could decide on the machinery by which the compensation fund was to be administered, otherwise they would run the risk of setting up machinery which, after all, might not be suitable to the Bill in its final form.

Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) said he did not often interest himself in proposals to postpone a clause, but in this case he saw strong reasons for the postponement. He was surprised that the Government had not accepted the proposal to postpone the clause, because to do so would undoubtedly save much time. He frankly admitted that he had no special desire to save time in the interest of a Bill to which he did not give even that minimum support the Solicitor-General was in the habit of giving to measures of the

Government. Considering the main purposes of the Bill, the giving of security on the one hand and setting up compensation on the other, obviously the more logical course would be to proceed with the second clause first.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL (Yorkshire, Cleveland) said the Home Secretary appeared to oppose the Motion on the very ground on which it had been moved. A mere reference to the sidenotes to the clauses showed that the main principle of the Bill was contained in Clause 2, which dealt with "Payment of compensation on non-renewal of licence." Surely, then, the second clause should be considered first.

MR. TREVELYAN (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland) said the Prime Minister, in his speech on the Second Reading, rebuked them for being so indignant at the transfer of power from petty to quarter sessions on the ground that the whole was better than the part; that showed that in the opinion of the Prime Minister the transfer of power from the justices to quarter sessions was of lesser importance, for, as he right hon. Gentleman said, it was merely a transfer from the part to the whole. It was perfectly clear that the only clause of vital importance was the compensation clause. The theory of the Government seemed to be that the opposition to the Bill came only from temperance reformers, who according to the right hon. Gentleman were imbued with hatred of the publicans. That they gathered from his speech on the Second Reading. But several weeks had elapsed since the Second Reading, and the great body of opposition to the Bill was now seen to come from moderate men and not from extreme temperance reformers, their main demand being for a time limit. This constituted a strong reason for taking the compensation clause first. The matter had become more important since the Solicitor-General had by gesture intimated that he had not suggested that the Government would yield on the question of a time limit. Perhaps they had not made up their minds and were still open to persuasion. In that case let them at once proceed to discuss what, after all, was the most important part of the Bill.

Question put.

The Committee divided: Ayes, 116; Noes, 227. (Division List No. 134.)

AYES.

Abraham, William, (Cork,N.E.
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Cawley, Frederick
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Ellice,Capt. E.C(SAndrw'sBghs
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Gladstone, Rt. Hon. Herb.John
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt,RtHn.Sir W(Monm't
Hayter, Rt. Hon Sir Arthur D.
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Hobhouse, C.E.H. (Bristol, E.)
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones, William(Carnarvonshire
Kearley, Hudson E.
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Jos. F. (Accrington)
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lyell, Charles Henry
M'Kenna, Reginald
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mellor, Rt. Hon. John William
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Hussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Malley, William
Palmer, Sir Chas. M. (Durham)
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Perks, Robert William
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Reid, Sir R. Threshie(Dumfries
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.

Samuel, Herbert L.(Cleveland)
Schwann, Charles E.
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spencer, Rt.Hn.C.R(Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan,E.)
Thomas, D. Alfred (Merthyr)
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Ure, Alexander
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, Jn. Cathcart (Orkney)
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Chas. Henry (Hull, W.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Woodhouse,Sir J.T(Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES, Mr. Trevelyan and Mr. Slack.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Aird, Sir John
Allhusen, Augustus Hen. Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster,Rt.Hn.Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt.Hn.Sir H.
Austin, Sir John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A.J.(Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bignold, Arthur
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boland, John
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brymer, William Ernest
Burke E. Haviland
Butcher, John George
Campbell,J.H.M.(DublinUniv.)
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain,Rt Hn.J.A(Worc.
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cullinan, J.
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Davies, Sir H. D. (Chatham)
Delany, William
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dimsdale, Rt. Hn. Sir JosephC.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Dyke, Rt.Hn.Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fergusson,Rt.Hn.Sir J.(Manc'r
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Firbank, Sir Joseph Thomas
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, P. S. (Warwick, S.W.)
Galloway, William Johnson
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gordon, Hn.J.E.(Elgin&Nairn)
Gore,Hn G.R.C.Ormsby-(Salop
Gore, Hon. S.F.Ormsby-(Linc.)
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene,Sir E.W(B'rySEdm'nds
Greene, Henry D.(Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.)
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Gunter, Sir Robert
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton,Marq.of (L'nd'nderry
Hardy, L. (Kent, Ashford)
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th
Hayden, John Patrick
Heath,Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heath, James (Staffords., N.W.
Heaton, John Henniker
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse,RtHn H(Somers't,E
Hope, J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Howard, Jn. (Kent, Faversham
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Hutton, John (Yorks., N.R.)
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W.(Salop.
Kerr, John
Kimber, Henry
Knowles, Sir Lees
Lambton, Hon. Ferderick Wm.
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Jos. (Monmouth
Lawson, J. Grant (Yorks., N.R.
Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham)
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W.(Evesham
Long, Rt. Hon. W. (Bristol, S.)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Iver,Sir Lewis(EdinburghW.
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Middlemore, Jn. Throgmorton
Milner, Rt.Hn.Sir Frederick G.
Milvain, Thomas
Mitchell, William (Burnley)
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Mooney, John J.
Moore, William
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute)
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow,W.
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Pease, Herb. Pike (Darlington)
Peel, Hn.Wm.Robert Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Pym, C. Guy
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Randles, John S.

Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Redshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Ritchie, Rt.Hn.Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robinson, Brooke
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Rothschld, Hon. Lionel Walter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Sir H. S. (Limehouse)
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, H.C(North'mb.Tyneside
Smith, James Parker(Lanarks.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Edward Jas.(Somerset
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.
Stock, James Henry
Stroyan, John
Sullivan, Donal
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt.Hn.Sir WilliamH.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt.-Col.A.C.E(Taunton
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H.(Ashton und.Lyne
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.
Wilson, J.W.(Worcestersh.,N.)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W.H.(Yorks.)
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

MR. ELLIS GRIFFITH moved to insert at the beginning of the clause, "During the period of seven years after the passing of this Act." The question of a time limit, which was raised by this Amendment, was one of the most important matters that would come up in connection with the Committee stage of the Bill, and he had hoped the Government would have an open mind on the matter. He trusted that even now the Committee would be allowed to decide the matter without any pressure from the Government Whips, in which case he believed a time limit would be inserted in the Bill. He was in the unusual position of having the whole Bench of Bishops on his side, and the Houses of Convocation had unanimously passed a resolution in favour of some such proposal as he was now putting forward. The particular period of seven years was not to be considered as in any way a vital portion of the Amendment; it might be ten or any other number of years; he desired to draw attention to the principle of a time limit without reference to the number of years concerned. In the Minority Report of the Royal Commission signed by Lord Peel and the Archbishop of Canterbury, a time limit of seven years was suggested. He understood the Prime Minister's attitude was that, although he was somewhat friendly in theory to the principle of a time limit, he thought it was quite alien to the principle of this measure. He could not see why this Bill should not be put into operation for seven years.

According to the Prime Minister, there were two theories. One was that a licence had the attributes of property and must not be taken away, without compensation, from the licensee, and the other theory was that the right hon. Gentleman was clearly of opinion that no trade was likely to be carried on under an uncertain tenure. They had already urged this question from a farmer's point of view, but the Prime Minister was not quite so emphatic about that, and he said that public-houses could not be conducted properly without some substantial system of tenure. He wished to point out that from 1830 to 1869 there was security of tenure, and that was just the time when public-houses were very badly managed. The metropolitan figures went back to the year 1844. These figures were very remarkable from the point of view that the more security they had the worse were public-houses conducted. For the three years 1844–45–46 the summonses averaged 907, but for 1867–68–69 the average rose to 1,233, so that free trade in beerhouses was a bad thing as far as the number of summonses was concerned. In 1869, after the power of magistrates was established, the number of summonses dropped from 1,233 to 444, whilst for 1897–98–99 they dropped to 391. The Prime Minister's view on this point was not one which commended itself to most hon. Members sitting on the Opposition side of the House, because they thought there was no legal right—and many of them thought that there was no moral right—to compensation, and they believed that this Bill would create a perpetual vested interest in licensed property. Many of them held the opinion that between the two extremes there was a medium course, and he thought the Amendment he proposed would meet the views of the moderates on both sides of the House. He was not committed to seven years limit, having given the licence-holders compensation for a certain number of years, after that period the justices should have unfettered discretion over the remaining public-houses.

The Prime Minister desired to prevent a loss to the trade, but temperance reform meant drinking less and that necessarily meant a loss to the trade and they could not get out of it. If this was to be a great temperance measure they must not complain if it should result in a little loss to the trade. The Prime Minister complained that if a time limit of seven years was accepted one man might lose his licence in the sixth year and another in the eighth year. No doubt there would be hard cases, but they should remember that the man who lost his licence in the eighth year had had possession of it for seven years. If they went back to the year of the decision given in "Sharpe *v.* Wakefield" and added the limit of seven years which he was proposing, the licensee would have had a period of enjoyment of his licence for twenty years. That, he thought, was a reasonable time, and a man could not complain after that if he lost his licence in the public interest. Without a time limit, instead of promoting temperance, this Bill would make the reduction of licences more difficult. To bring the number of licences in Wales and Monmouthshire down to the limit mentioned in the Minority Report, based upon the revenue provided for in this Bill, would take three-quarters of a century. He submitted that if the Government were really in earnest in this matter they would take this into their serious consideration. There was a large body of public opinion in this country in favour of a time limit. The Archbishop of Canterbury had declared himself in favour of it, and there was a great body inside the Church of England, as well as outside, who thought that a great deal of harm would be done unless some such Amendment as he had proposed were adopted. He asked the Prime Minister to leave this an open question, and, if he would do so, he believed the Committee, by a great majority, would come to the conclusion that this Bill would be improved, and its chance of doing good would be greatly magnified by the introduction of some such Amendment as he had proposed. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 5, to insert, at the beginning, the words 'During the period of seven years after the passing of this Act.'"—(*Mr. Ellis Griffith.*)

Question proposed, That those words be there inserted."

SIR WILLIAM HOULDSWORTH (Manchester, N.W.) asked if this Amendment would preclude the Committee from raising the question of the time limit for compensation at a later stage.

SIR JOHN GORST (Cambridge University) thought if the words of the Amendment were inserted they would apply to Clause 1 and to that clause only, and they would not limit the time for compensation to subsequent clauses, but only to the machinery of Clause 1.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I do not think that is quite so, because Clause 1 contains three principles. The first is that the jurisdiction shall be vested in quarter sessions instead of the justices; the second, that it shall only be exercised on a reference from those justices; and the third, that it shall only be exercised on payment of compensation. If a time limit is inserted it will apply to all of these principles, and no Amendment in Clause 2 will have to be made with reference to the time limit inserted in Clause 1. Therefore no Amendment either diminishing or increasing the time limit of this Amendment, if it is inserted, would be in order on Clause 2.

MR. ASQUITH (Fifeshire, E.): Supposing the Amendment of my hon. friend is rejected, would it then be out of order to move an Amendment on Clause 2 confining it to compensation only.

*THE CHAIRMAN: That will largely depend upon the character of the debate. If the debate follows the line opened by the hon. Member it must be assumed that the Committee will either accept or reject the time limit as applied to compensation, and that being so it could not be raised again on the second clause.

SIR ROBERT REID said according to the ruling the time limit to the clause proposed by the hon. Member would be a limit upon three things. In case the Committee should reject the limit upon those three things, surely they might consistently accept a limit upon one of those things. Was it not in order that the Committee should have an opportunity of saying on the second clause, or elsewhere, that although they were not prepared to limit the period during which the transfer of jurisdiction should take place nor the period during which there should be a reference from the petty sessions, yet they were prepared to insert a limit in other respects.

SIR JOHN GORST said the clause now under consideration, which was to be limited by the words proposed by the hon. Member, said that the refusal to renew a licence should be subject to "payment of compensation in accordance with this Act." If the clause were passed without any limitation, would it not be open to any hon. Member to move a restriction upon the payment of compensation under the Act—that was to say, that compensation should be paid only down to a certain date?

*THE CHAIRMAN: If no Amendment were made on the first clause, that would be so, but if the Committee now engages in a discussion which ranges over the question of the time limit, I think I should be precluded by the Rules of the House from allowing the same question to be opened up on a subsequent Amendment. If the House spends its time to-day, and possibly part of to-morrow, on that question it would be a pure loss of time to start the same question and discuss it all over again when the second clause is reached.

MR. ASQUITH said that in view of what had been stated by the Chairman, it would be far better that this Amendment should be withdrawn, and that the question of the time limit should be discussed later on.

MR. ELLIS GRIFFITH: After the appeal of my right hon. friend, and as I understand it would meet the wishes of the Committee [MINISTERIAL cries of "No."] I beg leave to withdraw the Amendment.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): If this Motion is negatived what happens?

*THE CHAIRMAN: Is it your pleasure that the Amendment be withdrawn? [Cries of "No."]

SIR EDWARD GREY (Northumberland, Berwick) said that if the Amendment should not be withdrawn it would, as he understood the ruling of the Chairman, apply to the three principles contained in the first clause. If there was a general desire to take the opinion of the Committee on the time limit for compensation, would it not be possible, if the Amendment were not withdrawn, that the debate should be confined to that point?

THE CHAIRMAN was understood to say that the debate could not be confined in that way.

SIR EDWARD GREY: Then it seems to me that we should be precluded from having it discussed at all.

MR. HALDANE (Haddingtonshire): As I understand your ruling it is this. It is not the wording of the Amendment that causes the difficulty, but the substance of the debate that follows on the Amendment. If the Amendment is negatived I submit to you the question whether it would not be possible to raise the whole question on a subsequent clause.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I think, looking to the Amendments placed on the Paper, that the general view of the Committee is that the time limit should be discussed on the first clause. I have looked through the Amendments, and I say that obviously that is what the Committee expected. There are twelve or fifteen Amendments raising the question of the time limit on the first clause, and there are two or three on the second clause. I cannot undertake to say that the Amendment of the hon. Member for Anglesey is out of order, but it is possible that some skilled draftsman might be able to devise some means by which the time limit for compensation might be better raised; I do say, however, that it is raised by the Amendment of the hon. Member, and if the Committee desires to discuss it now, and does discuss it now, I do not think that it can be discussed a second time. I do not wish to commit myself any further than that.

SIR EDWARD GREY: The question is whether if the Amendment is negatived now a discussion on the question of the time limit for compensation can arise later on.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I think there is something in what has fallen from the hon. Member, because the words of the Amendment are applicable to the three principles contained in the clause. If the Committee now says that it means the time limit shall not be applied to the three principles, it would be possible, I think, to raise the question at a later stage; but again I repeat, what I am afraid I have already said twice, that if the discussion in the Committee covers the whole ground, then I do not think I should be justified in allowing a repetition of the same arguments.

SIR WILLIAM HOULDSWORTH asked whether the case would be met by putting the words of the Amendment in line eleven before the words "on payment of compensation." The greater proportion of the fifteen Amendments to the first clause referred to line eleven and not to the first part of the clause.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I must put the Amendment which is moved provided it is in order, and I cannot undertake to say that it is not in order. Therefore, I must leave the Committee to decide in what manner the question is to be raised.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS said that on previous occasions the Chairman had ruled that no words could be inserted before the first line in a clause. In view of these rulings, was his hon. friend's Amendment in order?

*THE CHAIRMAN: I do not think I have gone so far as that. I have deprecated the inserting of Amendments before the first words, but I have never gone so far as to say that it cannot be done. I know of some cases in which it has been done. I have carefully considered the hon. Member's Amendment, and I do not think I should be justified in saying it is not in order, although some draftsmen might have drafted an Amendment which would have carried out the views of its supporters better.

SIR JOHN GORST said Clause 1 consisted of two sub-clauses. There were no words in the clause itself which applied to the whole clause. If the words of the Amendment were inserted they would apply only to the first paragraph and not to the second sub-clause.

*THE CHAIRMAN: If it became necessary to insert these words at the beginning of the clause they would be read right through the Bill. The second sub-clause of the first clause is really only the machinery by which the first sub-clause is carried out.

MR. AUSTIN TAYLOR (Liverpool, East Toxteth) asked whether the Amendments to Clause 1 put down by himself and others, and affecting merely the question of the exercise of the power with respect to the payment of compensation, would be ruled out of order under the ruling now given if the general principle in regard to the time limit was rejected by the House.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I am sorry to repeat again what I have already said. The question is raised by the Amendment now before the Committee. If it is discussed by the Committee at the present stage it cannot be discussed again.

*MR. WHITTAKER said he understood the ruling of the Chairman was that if they now discussed the Amendment proposed by his hon. friend, the three points contained in the clause would be decided. It was possible that the Committee might be against putting in a time limit on one of the points and in favour of a time limit on others. Many hon. Members wished only to deal with the time limit at present on the point of compensation.

*THE CHAIRMAN: It must depend very largely on the course of the debate whether this question can be discussed again.

SIR J. FERGUSSON (Manchester, N.E.) said the question before the Committee was whether the Amendment should be withdrawn. He was afraid he was not quite in harmony with some of his hon. friends in thinking that they should negative the proposal. He did not think they should gain anything by taking a decision on a false issue. The desire was that they should decide whether compensation should be limited to a certain number of years. They would gain nothing by avoiding a decision on that point, and complicating it by the question of jurisdiction which the other side did not desire at present to raise. He ventured to suggest to his hon. friends that they ought not to resist the request for leave to withdraw the Amendment. It could then be taken at a time when the real question could be submitted.

MR. CHAPLIN (Lincolnshire, Sleaford) said he did not see what the difficulty was of his right hon. friend. There was every opportunity of discussing this question now. Nobody ever said that this question was to be passed without any discussion. It was stated for days that this question was to be discussed on the first clause and everybody understood that that was to be so. Hon. Gentlemen opposite had suddenly discovered that it might not altogether suit their tactics, but he saw no reason why the discussion should not go on when all arrangements had been made for doing so. He heartily hoped that the Committee would insist on the discussion being proceeded with.

COLONEL WILLIAMS (Dorsetshire, W.) said that many hon. Members on that side of the House were of opinion that the time limit ought to apply to compensation and to compensation alone. He and others would naturally vote against the time limit being applied to the other two principles of the Bill. The time limit applied to compensation could be raised not on line 1 but on line 11.

MR. HALDANE said he wanted to know where the Committee stood. The right hon. Gentleman opposite was obviously anxious that the discussion on this Amendment should be proceeded with at once; while there were others on both sides who wished it postponed, the reason being that the Amendment did not raise the specific points they wished to debate. He understood that by the ruling of the Chairman, even if this Amendment were negatived that would not preclude other Amendments in which a very large number of hon. Members were interested from being raised on a later clause. Surely it was not the desire of the Leader of the House, or of the Committee itself, that the discussion of one of the most important and far-reaching questions that was to come before the House, should be hampered by a technicality! He appealed to the Prime Minister to define the course which he desired the debate to take.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): It was not I who put down the Amendments providing for a time limit, nor do I admit any responsibility, direct or indirect, for the difficulty, if there be a difficulty, in which the Committee finds itself placed. Frankly, I do not think there is a difficulty. Has any human being ever doubted that the real and only point on which those who desire to see a time limit introduced into the Bill is the point raised by the Amendment of the hon. and learned Gentleman? Everybody regards that as probably involving the greatest fight of the Bill. There is a *prima facie* objection to upsetting any general expectation of that sort, because it does interfere with the conduct of our debates. What is the theory? It is that there are a certain number of Gentlemen in this House who are anxious that the machinery in the Bill for distributing compensation should be made perpetual, but there are others who are anxious that the compensation to be distributed should be limited in time, and that we should not deliberate these matters as one. But does anybody, either on platforms or in newspapers, inside or outside this House, suggest that we should be called upon to make the dispossession of the brewster sessions of their present privileges and qualifications perpetual, whilst the reason for this change—the distribution of compensation—should be limited? Hon. Gentlemen opposite have always said that this dispossession of the privileges and qualifications of the brewster sessions was the last thing they wished for, but we have always associated the two things with the time limit, and I do not see why we should put the Committee to the great inconvenience, for the first time in all these debates, of making this unnatural divorce. I hope hon. Gentlemen will see that this Amendment raises questions which have been debated in this House and outside in the most convenient way.

SIR EDWARD GREY said he did not think the Prime Minister gauged the point raised. He did not believe that they on that side of the House objected to take the discussion on the Amendment as it stood; but the objection to take it at the present moment came from the right hon. Gentleman's own side of the House. [AN HON. MEMBER: From the Home Secretary.] Surely it was an unnecessary objection to insist that the discussion on the question of a time limit for compensation should be taken at a time inconvenient to many hon. Members, when it was perfectly possible to take it at another time.

*SIR WILLIAM HOULDSWORTH said he ventured to make an appeal to the Prime Minister. The difficulty in which hon. Members were placed was that a considerable number of the supporters of the Prime Minister had a very strong opinion as to the necessity for a time limit for compensation, but were not at all anxious to disturb the general framework of the Bill. They would be precluded altogether from indicating their opinions on the time limit if the Amendment was taken now. They wanted to discuss every part of the Bill on its merits. He was certain that the Government had not introduced this Bill simply and solely for the purpose of giving compensation to the trade; it was introduced to provide for a general improvement of the trade. He was afraid many of them on that side of the House would have to express their opinions very strongly as regarded compensation without a time limit.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.) said that before the question was settled he would give another reason. The Chairman had said it all depended upon the character of the discussion, but the Prime Minister could not absolutely dictate the character of any discussion. Therefore if they took the discussion now it would be very inadequate and inconclusive.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The Question is that the Amendment be withdrawn. [Loud cries of "No"].

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I should have liked, before making any argumentative statement to the House, to have heard the opinions of other hon. Gentlemen opposite, besides the able speech of the hon. and learned Gentleman who introduced the Amendment. I gather that the Committee would like to hear the opinion of the Government upon the general question raised by the suggestion that the provisions of the Bill should be limited in their character. I am well aware that there are a certain number of hon. Members behind me who are in favour of this Amendment, and I am well aware that outside this House authorities who justly carry great weight have thrown in that great weight in favour of the time limit. I think the hon. and learned Member himself has made allusion to Convocation and to the line taken up by a very large body of clergy. Now, I am the last person in the world to speak with the smallest shade of disrespect of the clergy of any denomination in connection with the temperance question. I believe there is no class of the community which from the circumstances of their position are brought more closely into touch with the appalling evils which excess in drink produces in the community at large, and all the clergy who work among the poor must, if it be possible, have a livelier feeling upon this subject than the ordinary layman. They come even more closely than we do into connection with the evils which we and they desire to see mitigated by temperance reform. The ardour of their passion for the reform of this great evil, I think, deserves and has received the full sympathy and approval of every man in every part of the House ; but when they come to discuss the purely secular methods by which this House—this Parliament—ought to deal with questions of legislation affecting the public at large, affecting questions of property, and all the varied and complicated interests of society, I do not think that any special training which the clergy may have had gives them any special title to give an opinion upon such matters. In the employment of spiritual weapons, in the endeavour to raise the moral tone of all classes of the community, upon which ultimately every great reform must be based, the services of the clergy are invaluable and cannot be dispensed with. But when they come to tell us without, as far as I know, any critical examination of the subject at all, exactly what provision this House should introduce into Bills dealing with temperance questions, then, Sir, I think we must all feel that, however much individual clergy by their ability or special knowledge of this subject may be qualified to help us, the clergy, as such, of any denomination have no peculiar title to be heard.

Let us turn, as behoves this Committee, to know exactly what it is we should gain or lose by endeavouring to introduce into this Bill the question of a time limit. I do not know whether hon. Members who advocate that have made up their minds what precisely is to happen when the time limit comes to an end. I gather from the hon. and learned Gentleman who moved the Amendment that his view of what would happen is that we should return to the *status quo*, so far as the law is concerned, but that there will be a great change in the equities of the case because at the end of the time limit, although the law will be precisely what it is now, and although at present the licence-holder may have some title to compensation, at the end of the period the law will again revert to its present position, and that then that equitable title will have lapsed. That is the view of the hon. and learned Gentleman. I do not quite see how that is to happen. What is there in the mere lapse of time under this Bill which will take away the equitable right to compensation which, not by the universal consent of this House, but in the view of the great majority of this House, the licence-holder now possesses. Let the House observe that I do not at all deny that you might continue a time limit which would altogether obliterate any further equitable title to compensation which the licence-holder might possess. I do not say whether it would be wise to have such a time limit or not. I think there are strong reasons, or reasons of considerable substance, against it. At all events, a time limit might be conceived. For example, the licence-holder has, and after this Bill will continue to have, in spite of what fell from the hon. and learned Gentleman, not a freehold at all, but, as it seems to me, an equitable right to consideration. If you chose to have a time limit during which you give him what he has not got now, absolute security of tenure, which this Bill will not give him, why, of course, at the end of that time, if you make the time of adequate length, he will have had compensation, because you will have given him something in return for what he loses by the fact that his property becomes absolutely subject to the magistrates' jurisdiction. Does anyone propose that? Is there any Amendment put down proposing that? Does anyone desire to see during the seven, fourteen, twenty-one, or thirty years—because all these periods are mentioned in various Amendments—that during any of those terms of years the licence-holder shall be free from interference except for misconduct. That is not proposed; and, therefore, the kind of compensation which a time limit may possibly give will not be given if you simply gradually introduce a time limit into this Bill as it is now framed.

Again, I can perfectly understand that a time limit might be equitable—I am not now discussing its expediency—if you did not give this absolute security of tenure for the period before the time limit came to an end but if you paid compensation to anyone dispossessed during that period out of public funds. But, there again, you do not do that; and I am perfectly unable to understand why, in the seven, fourteen, twenty-one, or thirty years, for which the time limit is proposed the mere fact that the licence-holders and the trade have been paying what amounts to an insurance for that period—I am quite unable to see how, when that insurance comes to an end with the time limit, any equitable right they now possess to consideration should vanish with the vanishing of the period during which this Bill is to last. Those are arguments based on the pure equities of the case; and I would earnestly ask my friends on this side of the House who are anxious to deal equitably with the trade whether they can see any answer to that argument. I have turned it every way in my mind; and I am unable to find any answer. If they came forward and proposed that the public should pay this insurance or proposed that without any payment of insurance there should be at all events fixity of tenure for a certain period, then I should understand the position; but at present I find it very difficult to see how they justify the attitude they take up on this question with their general view that the trade deserves equitable, though I quite admit not more than equitable, treatment.

Let me turn from the equities of the case to the expediencies of the case, because the expediencies of the case may, at all events, appeal to those who are deaf to the arguments I have endeavoured to base on the equities of the case. What are you going to do for the cause of temperance or the better conduct of public-houses by introducing a time limit? In the first place let it be noted that by introducing a time limit into your compensation you reduce the fund out of which compensation is to be given, and by reducing that fund you reduce the amount which can be immediately applied to the purpose of compensation. [AN HON. MEMBER: No.] Of course you cannot borrow on a seven years term a capital sum at all comparable to that which the local authority can now borrow and instantly apply to the diminution of public-houses. I should have thought, from that point of view, those who are interested in this measure as temperance reformers would hesitate before accepting a time limit.

MR. WHITTAKER: May I suggest that the time for making the levy on the trade need not be the same as the time for making compensation to the trade.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Then I quite believe that the hon. Gentleman, who takes a somewhat different view from many on this side of the House, would be responsible for a proposition that would require the trade to insure themselves for all time, but to get the benefit of the insurance for only seven years. I hardly think he will find many supporters on our side, and even on his own side of the House there may be some who will shrink from so very drastic a proceeding. Then I take up another point, based on what I may call the temperance expediency of this question. Who is going to take a public-house or enter the trade during the last few years before the time limit expires? The hon. Gentleman proposes seven years. Who in the last three years of this period is going to take a public-house, or, if he takes a public-house, is going to conduct it or spend capital upon it in order to fit it for the purpose for which it is intended? You will clearly only get into the trade on those terms and with such a period the very men whom you do not want, the men who are irresponsible, who do not either themselves possess or cannot command the capital to carry it on; who live from hand to mouth, and who, living from hand to mouth, have no sense of the responsibility which attaches and which ought to attach to the conduct of a trade which, whatever else you may say of it, is carried on under extremely difficult conditions. The third point based on the question of temperance expediency to which I will call attention is, what are you going to do with the beerhouses? I used to be told in the earlier days of the discussions on this Bill that as between beerhouses and ordinary public-houses, it was the beerhouse that was the great difficulty, the great scandal, and the great obstacle to temperance reform, and that it was the freehold tenure of the beerhouses, which of course you cannot take away, and which was established by Mr. Gladstone in 1869, which has always been the obstacle in the way of temperance reform in dealing with licensed houses. If you have a time limit, at the end of the time limit your insurance stops, your power of taking away any licence without compensation stops, your power of taking away beerhouse licences stops also, because although inequitably but legally you can take away a public-house licence at the end of the term, you cannot take away a beerhouse licence. That reverts to its existing condition, a stumbling-block in the way of temperance reform, unless you are prepared to find funds for its extinction—the class of house which has been the despair of everybody who has endeavoured to deal with this question. The hon. Gentleman has not made a suggestion of how to deal with this difficult problem. I do not see how you can deal with it at all if you insist on mutilating the Bill in the sense in which the hon. Gentleman proposes. You may say that, provided the trade gets a sufficiently long period in which the Bill is to be in operation, whether it is to be the hon. Gentleman's seven years or the Archbishop's twenty years, they could insure the whole of their property against the expiration of that period. But then you will be imposing a double insurance upon the trade—you compel them under this Bill to insure out of their funds, and if you adopt a time limit you make it necessary for them to prepare for the evil day by insuring against the magistrates making havoc with their property. Again, if you come to the conclusion that the trade ought to bear that additional burden—which, as I have said, I do not think just—you ought to put that second insurance into the schedule of the Bill, for then you will place in the hands of the local authorities a larger sum of money for the abolition of licences. But in my view, unless you mean to inflict a considerable injustice upon the trade, it would be far better, in the interest of temperance, that the Bill should remain as it stands.

Then how about the magistrates? What position do you put them in? At the end of the period of the time limit they will be exactly in the same difficulty that they find themselves in now. The difficulty of the magistrates—as I have more than once pointed out—is that they have to compare and balance two things which cannot be compared and balanced—the interest of the general community of a particular locality in regard to the number of public-houses in that locality, and the hardship they must inflict upon a publican by turning him out of his holding into the street. I do not know whether you will ever get rid of that difficulty. It is perfectly true that in regard to new public-houses the magistrates will be able, and it will be their duty, so to arrange matters that none of the monopoly value of the licence goes to the licence-holder, but that it all goes to the public in some form or other. But there is a part of the value of the licence which represents the capital the licence-holder must expend if he is to have a public-house at all. Of course, if the magistrates gave a lease to such a man, that would be compensation, or if they paid him compensation for the capital which he expended upon the public-house that would be a fair way of dealing with him. But so long as there are men whom you require to spend in this business capital which they may lose, you must, either in the form of the tenure you give them, or in the form of the compensation you give them, compensate them, and so you will never escape from the problem of compensation. One other observation occurs to me. If the local authorities do their duty, by the end of a long period of fifteen or twenty years I do not believe that the number of public-houses will be in excess of the requirements of the district. If that be so, what is the object of throwing everything into confusion before the end of the period, and at the end of the period leaving these people, who, after all, are carrying out a public necessity, to hold under a tenure which you do not require any other business to hold under? I think that after what I have said the Committee will feel that it is not without serious consideration, and not without grave and adequate reasons, that the Government think that a time limit ought not to be introduced. I can assure them that the matter has been subjected by us to the most careful and critical examination, and if in the speech which I have just made I have not convinced the Committee that we had real and sound reasons for the decision which we have arrived at, that is the defect of my oratory, and not the defect of the case which we defend.

MR. LLOYD WHARTON (Yorkshire, W.R., Ripon) said it had been stated in the course of the debate that those who signed the Majority Report of the Royal Commission which sat to consider this question were in favour of a time limit. He was the only representative now in the House of the seventeen men who signed that Report, and he begged leave to state that the whole seventeen were utterly and absolutely opposed to any time limit whatever. Of the seven Gentlemen who drew up the Majority Report two had passed away but the five who remained, of whom he himself was one, were absolutely agreed as to the question of a time limit. His own notion was that if this time limit was introduced into the Bill it would kill all good the Bill desired to do. His firm conviction and belief was that by this Bill the magistrates would be enabled to do the justice which they could not now do. Over and over again magistrates would, as it were, have supported the Court below had they been able to give compensation and justice, and it was the inability to give compensation that very often prevented them from doing what they believed to be their duty. The proposition laid down in the Majority Report was that an annual sum of £500,000 a year should be raised; this Bill proposed to raise £1,200,000, a very different thing, and consequently there was no necessity to provide large borrowing powers. What would happen at the expiration of the time limit if there was a considerable sum of money in the hands of the country? Who would take that? This Bill was a good Bill as it stood. To leave out compensation would leave the Bill like "Hamlet" with the Prince of Denmark left out, but to insert a time limit would kill the Bill.

Mr. HENRY CHAPLIN said no Member of the House was more anxious to see reform in favour of temperance than himself. He had himself never hesitated, when he thought the public-houses on his own estate were in excess of what was required, to close them when he found he could do so with honesty and justice. He had been a Member of that House for a longer period than many hon. Members, but he never remembered a time when the question of temperance reform was not before them, yet nothing whatever had been done. There was an opportunity of doing something at last and he appealed to the Committee not to lose that opportunity. The Bill contained provision for compensation, and an Amendment had been moved for the purpose of inserting a time limit. If the Opposition could find a time limit that would work and that would not have the effect of making the Bill practically a dead letter, he would be perfectly ready to consider it, but the House had had no enlightenment whatever on that point. He was unable to see how any proposal of the kind could work consistently with the Bill. He asked the hon. Gentlemen who supported the Amendment to offer some explanation to the House. They knew perfectly well that the men who were to contribute for the purposes of compensation were those in the trade, and how could they be expected to make any contribution if there was to be a time limit for either a short or long period? If a time limit was inserted it would be impossible to give compensation, because if it was known that at the end of a certain period they would receive no compensation, the people would not contribute to the fund. He began to suspect that hon. Gentlemen opposite were finding out that there was very little indeed to be said for their proposals, otherwise they would tell the Committee how the Amendment would work. If any Member could tell him of a reasonable scheme for a time limit, not only would he most carefully consider it—because he had an open mind on the question—but he would support it. He did not, however, think any such scheme was possible. In view of the absence of any explanation of the probable working of a time limit, the only inference to be drawn was that the real object of the Amendment was not so much to have a time limit as to devise a means by which the Bill could be wrecked.

Sir JOHN KENNAWAY (Devonshire, Honiton) said he had listened with great interest to the arguments of the Prime Minister, but he had come to the conclusion that the difficulties mentioned, although great, were not so insurmountable as they were made out to be. It might not be unfairly stated that a licensee who paid £10 a year for fifteen or twenty years would receive adequate consideration in the security he would enjoy during that period, and that as the time approached for the expiry of compensation he would be able to make arrangements, by insurance or otherwise, to meet a possible crisis. He was not, however, wedded to a time limit. His feeling was that, as they were making a very great experiment by which they would create vested interests which it would be very difficult indeed afterwards to deal with, there should be some time for reconsideration of the scheme after they had embarked upon it. If the scheme were found to be good there would be no difficulty in continuing it, but if they passed the Bill just as it was without any time limit or alternative to a time limit, they would place themselves in a position from which there would be no retreat, however great might be the mistake they had made. He did not despair that they might in some way or other find a means whereby the working of the Bill could be reviewed after a certain time without doing any injustice. There had been so many mistakes in temperance legislation, which had been passed with the best intentions, that he felt there should be something not absolutely final in the Bill until they had seen how it worked.

* SIR WALTER THORBURN (Peebles and Selkirk) said he had clearly stated to his constituents that under no circumstances would he vote for a Bill in which compensation was not given in the shape either of a time limit or of a monetary grant contributed by the trade itself, and he had also declared most emphatically that he would never support a measure under which compensation was to be paid to licence-holders out of the rates or taxes of the country. The Government had adopted one of the two alternatives he had always suggested, and he thought their decision was a wise one, because under the present proposals the reduction of licences would be rapidly proceeded with, whereas, if a time limit was given, practically no reduction whatever would be effected during the period of that limit. The Amendment before the Committee was absolutely impracticable, and, inasmuch as it was inconsistent with the principle of the Bill, he failed to see how it could be supported by any of his hon. friends who voted in favour of the Second Reading of the measure. It was possible to have a time limit without compensation, or compensation without a time limit, but in his opinion it was impossible in the same Bill to have both. He regarded the Bill as a mutual insurance scheme on the part of the trade, in which the premiums were collected by the Government, and if any man was unwilling or failed to pay his premium, his business automatically ceased. He asked the House to look at the proposal as practical men of business. Take for example the insurance of a ship. If underwriters, when a proposal was made to them, stipulated that unless the ship was lost or damaged within a certain period, they should be relieved of all liability, the shipowner would not insure except at a very low premium. But what would be the position of the licence-holders under the Bill if a time limit was inserted? The licence-holder would be unable to insure after the period of the time limit unless at an impossible premium to an Insurance Company, and, after having paid his premiums for a series of years, he would be liable to lose his business without a penny of compensation. In this matter he wished to do as he would like to be done by. He had no interest whatever in any business connected with the licensed trade, but he contended that the licence-holder was entitled to the same treatment as any other legalised trade. Upon this question he respected the feelings of teetotalers, although he did not take their extreme view. He considered the Bill a just and good one and one which would tend very largely to decrease the number of licensed houses, and as he believed it was impossible to engraft on it a time limit he must vote against the Amendment.

SIR WILLIAM HOULDSWORTH said he had listened with great interest to the statement of the Prime Minister upon this question. It appeared to him that they were proceeding upon a basis which he did not think was well founded. The case of each licence depended upon the proposition that the present licensee in the country had some sort of a vested interest of a freehold character, and if the right hon. Gentleman did not say this in so many words, at any rate his arguments were based upon some latent assumption of that kind. He was in favour of compensation, but he believed that there ought to be compensation and consideration. In the interests of temperance he felt strongly the position in which the magistrates were placed, and their hands would be very much strengthened if they were able to give consideration in cases where they took away licences without misconduct on the part of the holder. At the same time they must very seriously consider what they were doing if there was any time limit. They were entirely altering the tenure of the licence-holders and for all time they were altering their position in the country. They all knew that legally and equitably the licence-holders had taken these licences on a yearly tenancy, and when they heard of the large sums paid for these licences—unless they were rash and reckless speculations, which he was afraid in some cases they were, for ulterior purposes—there must be in the mind of a person who bought one of these houses some idea of the value based upon the profit-earning power, and he must to a certain extent take into account the possibility that the licence might be ultimately terminated. The only justification for consideration—though he thought it would be a great advantage and would promote temperance—was that Parliament was proposing, with the assent of the country, to place the magistrates in a position which would enable them to reduce the number of public-houses to a much greater extent and much more rapidly than appeared to be possible under the present system. But that did not justify in the slightest degree a Bill which would confer a permanent vested interest and a freehold property on men who at present had nothing of the kind. He was anxious to promote this compensation Bill, but he and his friends were also anxious to leave the door open for other temperance reforms to take place. There was a great deal going on in the country besides this Bill, which the Prime Minister claimed was a temperance measure. It to a certain extent extent was so, but a great many other temperance reforms were going on, and efforts were being made to institute public-houses which would do much less injury to the people, because they would not be maintained for profit and personal gain. He alluded to that great movement organised by the Public-house Trust Association. He believed that there was a great future before that association, and it seemed to him that this Bill as it stood would militate very much against the progress of that body. There were also other temperance proposals which he thought it would be unfair for them to make impossible of consideration. There was the question of popular control and other movements which if these houses got a permanent vested interest would be very seriously affected in the future. They were in a great difficulty in dealing with this matter on the spur of the moment, and under the position in which they were placed by this Amendment. It might be possible to limit this Amendment to the question of compensation and that would get one difficulty out of the way; but there was another difficulty, and it was that many of them were strongly in favour of a time limit and would carry their support of that principle to very great lengths, but they were not prepared to subscribe to a seven years limit, which they thought was too short. In an addendum which he put to the Minority Report he stated that he felt that seven years was too short and he suggested twelve years. Consequently he believed that fourteen or fifteen years would be a fair compromise which would carry with it temperance reformers on the one hand, and would not be oppressive to licence-holders on the other hand. Unfortunately they had to argue this matter upon this Amendment and they did not know what form it would take at the end of the discussion. At any rate, he and a number of his friends felt absolutely committed to a time limit for compensation, and they would be bound to support that view in the division lobby.

MR. ASQUITH asked the Chairman if he would be good enough to give the Committee a definite ruling upon this point—whether, having regard to the manner in which the Amendment had been debated and to the obvious desire of hon. Gentlemen who were in favour of a time limit confined to compensation, and to compensation alone, to reserve their arguments and their votes until that specific issue was raised, the negativing of the present Amendment would necessarily preclude the raising of the question of confining it to compensation.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The debate has not yet concluded and therefore it is difficult to pronounce a judgment upon it. Although the majority of those who have taken part in the debate have been so far against the Amendment, the Amendment has been supported by at least three hon. Gentlemen. I do not think I can hold, therefore, that the question has not been debated. I would also remind the Committee that there are no fewer than ten Amendments, nine of them coming from hon. Gentlemen on the Opposition Benches, all raising the question of a time limit at this stage. Therefore, in coming to any conclusion in regard to the character of the debate, I think I shall have to take into consideration the fact that these Amendments were given notice of, although they may not be supported by speeches.

MR. ASQUITH: Are we to take it, then, Sir, that you hold that, in view of the fact that the Amendment has been supported and opposed, if this Amendment were negatived it would not be competent for hon. Gentlemen to raise the same question, confining it to the limited point of compensation, either upon this or upon any subsequent clause?

*MR. MILVAIN (Hampstead) said he would remind the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Fife that the mover of the Amendment dealt with nothing else except the question of compensation. Personally he could not understand why, after so much had been made of this question of compensation on both sides of the House, and after it had been known for weeks that the first Amendment on the Paper was one affecting the principle of the Bill, hon. Members opposite should, if he might use the term, go down to avoid punishment. That was not facing the audience. Either they had no arguments to face the audience with, or they were afraid of the division lobby, or possibly both. He could not help thinking that the question of a time limit was altogether inconsistent with the nature of this Bill. On that side of the House he had heard hon. Members, in referring to the property held by licence-holders, describe it as not a vested interest. He had heard it described as an interest which was tenable only for one year. That might be so according to the letter of the law, but it was not so in the administration of the law. It had not been so regarded by the collectors of revenue who had levied rates and taxes as though a licensee had a right to the continuance of his licence during good behaviour.

There was one point which had not been mentioned in the House and which ought at all events to appeal to the hon. Members connected with the legal profession. It was this: When a person applied for a licence he had to show cause why the licence should be granted to him, and those who opposed the application had to show cause why it should not be granted. Whilst he was the holder of a licence, if any person objected to its being continued it was the objector who had to show cause why it should not be continued, leaving the inference that the licensee was entitled to continue to hold the licence until it was shown that it should be taken away. He was aware of the case of "Sharpe *v.* Wakefield," and everybody was aware that the magistrates had a discretion, but it was a discretion which must be exercised judicially, and not from caprice. It must be exercised discreetly, and if it was not exercised discreetly it was not exercised judicially. There was a feeling in a section of the community that licence-holders did not receive at the hands of licensing sessions such justice as was usually extended to the holders of other kinds of property. If in a district there were two public-houses, one on one side of the street and the other on the other side, and one was required for the carrying out of a local improvement, the licensee of that house received compensation for his property as a going concern, while the licensee of the other house would receive no compensation if his licence was refused for purposes of public policy. He wanted to know whether that was consistent, and he would ask any conscientious man where the difference existed between the two cases. If the licensee, subject to the judicial discretion of the justices, was entitled to a continuance of his licence; then it was property of a certain nature. If it was property of a certain nature why was it to be treated in any respect differently from other property? He would ask any hon. Member who was in favour of a time limit whether, if he held a leasehold property for sixty years, he would be content if told at the end of twenty years that it was to cease to have its value. Another consideration in connection with this matter was that a large number of these houses were mortgaged. What was to happen at the end of seven years if they said that then these mortgaged properties were to cease to have the value they had to-day? The result would naturally be that there would be foreclosure on the property, and again the trade would be put to a very severe and, in his opinion, a very unfair strain.

So much for inconsistency. He wanted to put another question as to expediency. What was going to be the result of the time limit? It was not, as the Prime Minister had said already, a matter where the public found the funds. The trade found the funds. It was not public money. It was compulsory insurance by the trade. The licence-holders were bound to subscribe. There might be insurance now, but all the members of the trade could not be got to go into it, and the result was that the premium charged to those who insured was heavier than it otherwise would be. But if they had a time limit they would have the anomalous position that the public-houses bought out would be the worst and probably the smallest. The licensee who was undesirable, though there might be against him nothing that could be shown to be legally wrong, would be bought out. He would receive his compensation, while the good man who conducted his house well would until the expiry of the time limit continue to subscribe to his insurance and at the end he would get nothing. But in addition to that the licensees would be obliged to enter upon a voluntary insurance at a higher premium to cover the risks after the time had expired. The Bill would have a result which was exceptionally desirable, namely, to drive the unscrupulous man out of the trade, and it would be an inducement to good men to enter it. He had heard of some clergymen conducting public-houses for the benefit of the community, and in order to supply good drink. There were also private gentlemen who conducted public-houses on the same principle. The Bill would encourage the sale of good stuff, and licensed victuallers would be so in fact and not in word only. A time limit would result in driving good men out of the trade, and men not so scrupulous would be tempted to take the risk of making money in the shortest possible time either by the sale of bad liquor or by illicit means. He thought it was an admitted fact that drinking was a decreasing vice. He thought experience justified the conclusion that the existence of too many public-houses was an encouragement of drinking. On the other hand, he thought it was equally true to say that if there were too few public-houses the evil was driven under the surface. What they ought to do was to find the mean, and the only way to find the mean was to approach the question and find what the result was over a term of years. [Laughter.] Not a limited term of years. He thought possibly after a very few years indeed they would find a very large and desirable reduction in the number of public-houses.

*COLONEL WILLIAMS said he thought it was time that something should be said about the Amendment itself, and specially about the term of years for which this Amendment was supposed to run. With all respect to his hon. friend below him, he always thought that a term of years must have an end, and to speak of an indefinite term was a contradiction in terms. Many hon. Members on that side of the House thought seven years was much too short a time limit, and he desired by his Amendment to substitute for the word "seven" the word "fourteen." He took fourteen as the term, because in questions of compensation, and in settlements as to the amount of death duties, the Commissioners of Inland Revenue adopted that term. It had been said that if a time limit were inserted, the owners of licensed premises had to enter into a double insurance; but there were many forms of insurance which were divided into two parts—one at one rate to insure for fourteen years, and another at a lower rate for a longer period afterwards. There was no difficulty as long as a man knew these conditions beforehand. It had been said that by making the insurance compulsory they were not converting an annual licence into a freehold licence, because the money came from the publicans; but so long as the insurance was compulsory, and so long as the publican paid the premium, so long did he get the right to have his annual licence renewed. Therefore, that made the licence practically a freehold. He contended that a time limit was necessary if it was wanted to maintain the annual character of the licence. In the course of years the annual licence had come to be practically regarded as renewable of right, but he wanted to revert to the old legal theory that it was only an annual licence still. In the course of years a certain vested interest had been allowed to grow up, and that, he admitted, should be bought out, and the vested interest done for. It had been said that if a period to compensation was imposed, in the last few years of that period inferior men would enter the trade and that nobody would spend money in keeping the houses in repair and be careful to maintain good order. His answer to that was that an annual licence conferred a very substantial bonus on the owner for which he had never paid a penny, and if he did not keep his house in good order he would lose the licence for these few years. That would compel him to conduct his house properly. For these reasons he thought a fourteen years limit was sufficient and would bring down the number of licences to the ratio which would be considered by moderate men as appropriate to the whole population.

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"To leave out the word 'seven,' insert the word 'fourteen.'"—(*Colonel Williams.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'seven' stand part of the proposed Amendment."

*MR. WHITTAKER said he was sorry to take part in the debate in this inconvenient way, but he was not responsible for having put down the Amendment to the first clause. It seemed to him that the key to the position was that the licence-holder had no right to a renewal. The State had carefully and specially reserved the power to refuse a renewal each year —so carefully that it required the licence-holder to specially apply each year for renewal to remind him that he held a precarious licence and that he might be refused it any year. All he had got was, as Lord Selborne had said, a *locus standi* for renewal. The market value of a licence was only the chance that the holder would get a renewal; but that was not property in any proper sense of the term. It should be borne in mind that every licence-holder had all along known the law and the risk he ran. He had deliberately and willingly taken that risk for the sake of the profits which he would get through being protected from competition. The Prime Minister dwelt on the fact that the licence-holders had to pay taxes and death duties. That was no argument. The Inland Revenue demanded taxes on the market value of anything a man held, but that did not imply that the Inland Revenue guaranteed that that was a reasonable value. Take the case of a gold mine, the shares of which might be worth £5. If the owner died these shares would be assessed at £5 each for death duties, but the shares might, in three or four years, not be worth 1s. or a penny. The Inland Revenue did not guarantee that they would always remain at a value of £5. Or the case of a racehorse; at the time of the owner's death it might be worth hundreds of pounds, but die in a few months. The Inland Revenue did not guarantee that the horse would live and win races. Or the case of pictures, which might be of exceedingly great value at the time of the owner's death; fashions, however, changed in pictures as in many things else, and the value might go down in a few years, but what the Inland Revenue took at the time was the market value. The successor took his chance.

It had been said that municipal corporations gave full compensation when a licence was taken away to effect public improvements, but the municipal authority had no power to interfere with the licence, and if they took it away they should pay compensation. It was the licensing justices who conferred the right and who could take it away at the end of a year —a very different case indeed. It had been said that the Lord Chancellor had decided that the licensing magistrates must exercise judicial discretion in refusing a licence, but the Lord Chancellor took occasion in a later discussion to explain what he had said and to point out that it had been misunderstood. If the magistrates took away a licence capriciously, and if that was proved to be the case, the licence-holder had a remedy. Therefore, that was no reason for giving compensation to licence-holders whose annual licence was taken away in the exercise of judicial discretion. He was one of those who was quite willing that some consideration should be shown to a licence - holder, but that was not a matter of legal or moral right, but of grace to facilitate temperance reform. He was in favour of compensation being given to the trade from the trade, for the public advantage in clearing away unnecessary licences. The Prime Minister said that it would be all right to give a licence-holder absolute security for a considerable term, subject to good behaviour, but that this Bill did not do that. His contention, however, was that it did give absolute security, and a pretty good security too, for the holder was to be handsomely paid for it if he lost it. The Prime Minister also said that the right which a licence-holder now had should not end with the end of the insurance; if the public paid the insurance it would be different. He (Mr. Whittaker) contended that the licence-holder had no right at present and therefore he would have none under this Bill.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said if he used the word "right" he used it in the sense of an equitable claim.

*MR. WHITTAKER contended that if an equitable claim was something less than a right, and the tenure something less than a freehold, then it was reasonable to terminate it by a notice. The real difficulty that had to be faced was that when they wanted to reduce a number of licences the justices found a great difficulty in selection. They found a dozen licences in a small area and thought three or four of them ought to disappear, but there was nothing that could be said against one of them that could not be said against the rest, and there was nothing that could be said in favour of one that could not be equally well said in favour of all. They felt that if they took away a licence they would inflict financial loss on the person whose licence they suppressed, and would confer a financial benefit on those whose licences were renewed. He himself favoured compensation to be paid by the licence-holders who were left, in which case it was easy to get over the difficulty of selection.

The Prime Minister had asked what benefit to temperance reform would accrue from a time limit. The right hon. Gentleman said, "Who would take a house for the last year of that period?" and developed an argument which he had to a small extent expounded on the Second Reading of the Bill, "At the end of the time limit you would get irresponsible men, living from hand to mouth, and the house would go to rack and ruin and no house would be worth anything at all." He ventured to say that precisely the contrary would be the result. The 1869 beerhouses had been referred to. They were the very worst houses in existence and the most difficult to deal with, but they were the houses with a security of tenure, and that fact alone should have shown the right hon. Gentleman that he had a weak point in his argument. That weak point was this, that the only thing that kept a house efficient and kept it well-conducted was the fear of losing the licence. In a locality where the time was running out the anxiety of every licence-holder would be that his should be the house whose licence would be renewed, and the result would be that there would be a competition between the licence-holders as to whose house should be best kept. There was no danger that the character of a house would deteriorate by the introduction of a time limit. It would improve. He had been informed by a justice on the Liverpool Bench only recently that when the Liverpool Bench first refused the renewal of its licence to a large house that was badly conducted no one could conceive the effect which it had upon other houses in the district. The prospect that a badly-managed house would lose its licence at the end of the time limit period would do more than anything else to insure its being properly conducted. The 1869 beerhouse stood in a different position to the ordinary public-house, but nobody would contend that it should have a licence for all time. It had a licence granted by Parliament for the benefit of the public, but it was in the power of Parliament to revise and reverse its decision with regard to it. It was not a freehold—an absolute property [AN HON. MEMBER: It is a freehold now.] It was merely a Parliamentary grant and subject to revision. An instance of that was seen in the case of the off-licences for beer. "Off-beerhouses" were in precisely the same position. The Act of 1869 put "off-beer" licences in exactly the same position as the 1869 beerhouses; but the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Croydon, the late Chancellor of the Exchequer, at the instigation of the trade itself, passed a Bill through this House without discussion, which gave the magistrates full and free discretion in the case of the "off"-licences. What was fair for "off-beer" could not be unfair for "on-beer," and they could not now claim that the 1869 licences were exempt.

The Prime Minister had suggested that under a time limit the trade would be put in the position of paying an insurance against the risk of non-renewal of the licences, and then paying an insurance for the purpose of insuring the capital value of the licences at the end of the time limit. It must be remembered that these licence-holders held an extremely profitable monopoly. It had been said they would get nothing by such an insurance, but he would venture to point out that for the premium paid they would get protection against the risk of the non-renewal of their licence. Then they would have to set up a sinking fund to redeem the value of the licence at the end of the time limit, and thus deal with it as every other wasting security was dealt with by a wise man. The object of this compensation in this Bill was to reduce the number of licences, but the effect of reducing the number of licences would be to make those that remained much more profitable; it meant that in the future the licences would not increase in proportion to the population of a district, and the great additional value which would be given to those houses would be more than sufficient to pay the sinking fund. They could not have temperance reform without less profit being made out of drink, but that process could be made easier by spreading the loss over the whole trade for a considerable time. All these brewery companies—and four-fifths of the licensed houses were in the hands of the brewers—had either provided large reserves out of profit, or sinking fund, for the redemption of the loans, or they ought to have done so. They knew they had a wasting security and were prepared for it, and therefore the losses would not be much to them.

The right hon. Gentleman had also said the justices would be in the same difficulty at the end of the period as they were now; that there would still be the difficulty of selection. They had been giving people this valuable privilege and charging them a nominal sum for it. That was the whole difficulty. If they charged the full value for a licence it would have no market value, and no compensation difficulty would arise. Take an illustration. If a man rented a house worth £100 for £100, there was no market value in that tenancy, and no one would give him anything for the right to live in that house. But if the landlord let that £100 house for £20, then the tenancy would have a market value and the tenant could sell it. That was the position with regard to licences. They let people have licences of great value for a nominal sum, and, therefore, they acquired a market value. If at the end of the time limit, Parliament continued to allow licences to be issued at a nominal sum, certainly compensation value would accrue again, and they would have the same difficulty to face as they had to-day. But he thought that sane, business-like men would at the end of the time limit put the issue of licences on an altogether different footing. They would at once begin to issue licences at their full market value. That did not mean that men holding licences should not continue to hold them, but they would have to pay full value for them. There would be no compensation difficulty, no market value, and that was the answer to the Prime Minister when he said that the licensing justices would at the end of the time limit have the same difficulty to face as now. First, let them get the number of licences down to something like a reasonable number in proportion to population, and then they would be readily insurable at a very low rate, because everyone would know that further reductions would be few indeed. It should be remembered in the whole of this discussion that a licence was not a freehold. Licences were not bought and sold in the market as if they were a freehold. A licence was a wasting security, and there should be a time limit when the equity of the matter could be arranged. The prices of licensed houses varied very much; but he believed it was a fair estimate to say that a good price would be twelve or fourteen years purchase. Every one knew that fourteen years purchase was equivalent to a twenty-five years run. £1 a year for twenty-five years at 5 per cent. was worth £14 to-day; and fourteen years purchase would represent a twenty-five years run. His point was that a licence was a terminable security, not a freehold; and it was essential that there should be a time limit. The Inland Revenue dealt with licences on the basis of something like twelve or fourteen years purchase. It did not assess them as if they were to continue for ever, but assessed them as terminable securities which had a fair chance of a considerable run.

As regarded the length of the time limit, he would be quite amenable; but what he felt anxious about was that the levy should be a national levy. The local levy was the seat of much difficulty in this matter. Clause 1 would never be required if a local levy were not proposed; and if a national levy were substituted they would get over a great deal of their difficulty. Further, he would have no objection to supplement the levy with a certain amount of additional taxation on liquor. An addition of 5 per cent. to the amount which the trade now paid would be more than ample to bring about any reduction which the most sanguine person had ever thought of. It would manage everything and would sweep away the greatest number of licences that anyone had ever spoken about. But under this Bill they were not going to get any substantial reduction; the value of the licences would increase, and the difficulties they now had to contend with would be intensified.

Something was said by an hon. Gentleman opposite with which he cordially agreed, and that was that whatever might be their views as to certain reforms that were suggested, certain facilities for popular control and disinterested management, they ought not to close the door against them in the future. This Bill did fatally close the door; and that was, in his judgment, a great objection to the measure. At the present time, with licences which might be refused renewal, they were in a position, whenever Parliament deemed it advisable, to institute any method of controlling the liquor trade they might wish. He felt more than some people recognised the enormous difficulty of dealing with the liquor question. It was one of the most difficult problems they ever had to deal with, and he attached an enormous importance to allowing localities to make experiments and to work out their own salvation in their own way. If they did that they might in the course of time discover some method, not antagonistic to the national sentiment, which would enable them to grapple with this question in a satisfactory way. They could not have those experiments without giving the fullest freedom to the localities; and whatever their opinion might be as to this, that, or the other reform, they ought not to close the door to the possibility of their being introduced. The Prime Minister did not think that the Bill would close the door to further reform. Might he take local veto as a test? That was a remedy which was widely resorted to in every English-speaking country in the world except this country. Hon. Members opposite might be of the opinion that this country was not ripe for it; but they should not close the door against that remedy. Local veto would be absolutely impossible under this Bill, because if the compensation levy was to be made on houses in the locality, houses must be retained in order to pay it. If they were all swept away compensation would have to be paid by the public; and the Bill admitted that there was no claim against the public and no right to compensation in the ordinary sense.

Compensation was not the proper word. This was a levy on the trade itself to find money for itself. If anyone had a right to compensation, would it not be an insult to ask him to put his hand into his own pocket? Therefore, the fact that the Government proposed that the compensation should be paid by the trade was proof enough that the trade had no claim whatever on the public; and that it was not compensation in any sense. Further, it would be a gross wrong if, in order to introduce some other methods of reform, they were to put this money on the rates or taxes, and give the trade a claim to which this Bill admitted they had no right. Therefore, the Bill blocked the way as regarded local veto; and it also blocked the way with regard to any satisfactory measure of distinterested management. The key-note of disinterested management was that they should get rid of the stimulus of private profit; but they would be jumping out of the frying pan into the fire if they transferred private profit into public profit. If they had to raise a large sum of money in order to buy out licences they would be blocking the way to disinterested management. Under disinterested management, the amount of money invested was extremely small; but if they could only have philanthropic management at the cost of scores and hundreds of millions sterling to buy up the trade it would cease to be disinterested management and would be only another form of speculation. Therefore the Bill blocked the way to the two methods of reform which were most prominently before the country at the present time.

He contended there ought to be a time limit, in order that there might be full freedom and ability to introduce any measure of reform they might desire. The Bill would stereotype monopoly. The Prime Minister expressed his desire to end this monopoly, but the Bill would increase it. The Bill would increase and intensify that monopoly, and stereotype the tied-house system, which was one of the most objectionable features of the business. A different method should be tried. The present monopoly had been in existence long enough. It had had protection from competition, and had made enormous profits. He doubted whether the Committee realised how great were the profits which had accrued to the trade by virtue of its monopoly, and those excessive profits were the real compensation. In 1802 to 1830 the liquor trade paid two and a half times as much taxation per barrel of beer as they now paid. They were taxed to the extent of 10s. per barrel of beer; 4s. 5d. per bushel of malt (and two bushels of malt were required for one barrel of beer); and this, together with the impost on hops, made the taxation on the beer trade range from 12s. to 20s. per barrel. The tax of 10s. per barrel was taken off when the Beer Act of 1830 was passed and had never been reimposed, but the consumer still paid just as much for his glass of beer, every penny of the relief from taxation having gone into the pockets of the liquor sellers. Moreover, the cost of the grain out of which the the liquor was made was only a fractional part of what it used to be, and scientific improvements had enabled brewers to get five barrels of beer out of the material formerly used for four. This monopoly had prevented the working of the ordinary economic laws. Lower taxation, cheaper material, and improved scientific methods, instead of resulting in a cheaper article had simply enabled the makers of the article greatly to enhance their profits, and now, forsooth, because those profits had rendered the houses in which the liquor was sold enormously valuable they asked for compensation! The monopoly had been its own compensation; it had been long enjoyed, and there was no claim, legal or moral, for any compensation whatever.

The only ground on which he supported compensation was as a matter of expediency to facilitate a great public reform. Those who had enjoyed this great privilege had no right whatever to its continuance; and certainly they had no legal right to its continuance at the present licence fee. Parliament had always retained full right to fix the licence fee at any amount it chose, and whatever might be said about the liquor seller's equity in the renewal of his licence, he had no equity whatever in the present licence fee. With perfect justice and considerable ease Parliament could raise the licence fee, and the bottom would be knocked out of the compensation claim within twenty-four hours. He, therefore, reminded members of the liquor trade that if this Bill were forced upon this country in its present form and by this Parliament there were more ways of killing a cat than by hanging it. Liquor sellers had no right to licences at the present rate of duty; they had no moral or legal right to object to anybody else having a licence; the value of their licences depended upon the monopoly; and if everybody who desired one could have a licence on the same terms there could be no market or compensation value. If Parliament fixed the licence fee sufficiently high, and declared that every man of suitable character with suitable premises might have a licence, he believed the number of licences would be reduced and there would be no compensation value attaching to any. They would then get rid of all the obnoxious——

*THE CHAIRMAN: I think the hon. Member has rather forgotten the Amendment that is now before the Committee. That Amendment deals with a time limit, but the hon. Member is ranging over the whole subject.

*MR. WHITTAKER admitted that he had gone somewhat beyond the Amendment, and apologised for so doing. His point was that the holders had no claim, legal or moral, to these licences; that they were not entitled to anything like full compensation, inasmuch as Parliament had certain rights in reserve which would cut down the value of the licence; that the licence was not a freehold or a permanency; and that, therefore, Parliament was entitled to impose a time limit. Possibly his argument was somewhat involved, but he thought it was relevant in the long run. An hon. Member on the other side had given the real name for what ought to be done, when he said the Bill was a mutual insurance scheme under which the payment of premiums was compulsory. That was what it ought to be. What was the position in which Parliament found itself? There had grown up in licences a market value to which the holders had no legal right, and the existence of that value placed a serious difficulty in the way of the administration of the licensing laws, of securing such a reduction of licences as was necessary, and of obtaining that freedom to deal with licences which everybody desired. The practical question with which Parliament had to deal was how should that difficulty be dealt with as a matter of expediency and practical politics? One thing was perfectly clear, viz., that the proper way to deal with it was not to turn the licence into a freehold.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Hear, hear!

*MR. WHITTAKER: But that is practically what you are doing.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR dissented.

*MR. WHITTAKER submitted that if full value were paid the licence would practically be turned into a freehold. He suggested that substantial notice should be given, that a substantial time limit should be fixed, during which compensation should be paid to the trade; and at the end of that period licences should be issued on entirely new conditions. Parliament would then have a clear field to introduce whatever reforms it chose, and no wrong would be done to anybody. In some way, at some time, Parliament must recover full liberty to deal with the trade, and that could not possibly be done unless a time limit was fixed: the Bill as it stood would block the way. That was a serious position; in his judgment it was intolerable, and should the Bill in its present form be passed it could never be accepted as a final settlement of the question.

*SIR FREDERICK MILNER (Nottinghamshire, Bassetlaw) said there was another side to this question to that which had been taken by the hon. Member for the Spen Valley. He had heard with great pleasure the decisive line taken by the Prime Minister with regard to the question of a time limit, and he hoped he would remain firm upon that point. If the Government accepted a time limit they might as well drop this Bill altogether. How could it reasonably be argued that this Bill was creating a freehold or a vested interest in licences, when at any time a licence might be taken away for transgressions under the Act? How could they be giving the licence-holder a freehold when they had power at any time to deprive him of his means of livelihood; and the compensation they would give would be fixed by the State, and provided by the licence-holder himself? That provision alone would prevent any increase in the value of licences. If any person was foolish enough to give an increased price for a licence on account of this Bill he did so entirely at his own risk and he would receive nothing extra as compensation. The compensation would be calculated as if this Act had not been passed, and therefore this Bill did not create either a freehold or a vested interest in the licence. The procedure adopted in this measure was the only way in which they could get this question settled. Temperance reformers had been pledged up to the hilt for the last fifty years to pass some drastic reform, but they could never do this until the question of compensation was settled. It had always been recognised as a principle in this country that they ought not to take away a man's property by an Act of Parliament without compensation by the State. In this case, however, the whole of the compensation was provided by the trade, and the only way to settle it was to adopt this clause without any time limit. If this Bill was passed he thought they would certainly see a steady, automatic reduction in the number of public-houses, a reform which was much needed. He hoped the Government would firmly stand by the attitude they had taken up on this question and remember the fiascoes of 1888 and 1890. With reasonable Amendments this Bill would effect what they all desired, namely, a steady reduction of the worse class of beer-shops and steady progress in temperance.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER (Staffordshire, Lichfield) said he wished to say a few words in support of the Amendment moved by the hon. Member for West Dorset. He recognised the enormous value of real temperance legislation, and whether they called it an equitable claim or, to use the phrase of his hon. friend, a *locus standi*, for having his licence renewed, the publican had some claim to compensation. But the licence ought not to be a freehold and the compensation ought to have some term put to it. Although he thought fourteen years was hardly long enough and should prefer twenty-one, he hoped the former period would be accepted as a compromise. Seven years was evidently inadequate, and he trusted his hon. friends on the opposite side would accept fourteen years. At the end of fourteen years the number of licences would have been so reduced that the fear of a licence-holder losing his licence would have disappeared and the Government could accept this compromise without injuring the licence-holder. In the interests of the cause of temperance there ought to be a time limit, and they ought not to tie the hands of posterity by adopting any hard-and-fast rule of compensation.

MR. CRIPPS (Lancashire, Stretford) said hon. Members opposite were under a misapprehension as to the effect of a time limit upon compensation, because that question was entirely outside the freehold question altogether. If the Bill was left in its present form without a time limit all that the licence-holder would be entitled to was what he would receive in an ordinary compensation case and neither more nor less than that. No licence-holder had ever been entitled to compensation as a freeholder, and all he was entitled to was what all property owners were entitled to when questions of compensation arose. A licence-holder was compensated as regarded the fair expectation of renewal he had in connection with the licensed premises, and that was the view on which this Bill was framed. The hon. Member opposite said that the time limit might be for twenty years. If they introduced a time limit in the way proposed by the hon. Member the first effect would be, not to diminish the amount to the licence-holder, but to give him an unfair amount of compensation to which he was not entitled at all. They wanted to see how the Bill would work out as between the public on the one side and the licence-holders on the other. The Bill, in his opinion, made fair provision in regard to the temperance question. With a time limit such as that suggested by the hon. Member for the Spen Valley Division the licence-holder would get a far larger measure of compensation than he could possibly get under the Bill as it stood.

If he did not mean that, the one argument of the hon. Member was that in regard to grace and propriety which, as he understood him, were both immoral and illegal. That was a matter for the consideration of the hon. Member. The true answer was that the question of the time limit had to be divorced from the question of compensation. They were not really dealing with the same subject-matter. By introducing a time limit they were not proposing that the licence-holder should have a certain number of years purchase. They were really diminishing the fund, and thereby decreasing the opportunities for temperance. They were reducing the fund which could be used under this Bill for the purpose of compensation in order to get rid of unnecessary public-houses. That would be the real result of introducing a time limit as proposed by hon. Members opposite and supported by some hon. Members on his side of the House. The hon. Member for the Spen Valley Division took as an illustration the case of fire insurance, and said they did not necessarily want the house to be burned down while the insurance was running. That was if the insurance was effected in perpetuity, but according to the time limit proposal there would only be compensation if the house was burned down in the first seven years.

What was the equity of a provision of that kind? These compensation questions were difficult and complicated. In the county of Buckingham, in which he was interested, an effort was made to work out a scheme on the same lines as those proposed in this Bill, but they were prevented because some of the brewers would not come into the scheme. Under this Bill they would be able to raise sufficient money as capital in the first instance to get rid of supernumerary public-houses, which they thought in the cause of temperance ought to be abolished. Supposing they had a time limit of seven, or fifteen, years they would be unable to raise a sufficient sum to carry out a proper temperance scheme. He wanted to know why the advocates of temperance on the other side should seek to put in a limitation of that sort. By doing so they would limit the fund from which compensation could be got and in that way they would make the Bill less effective for the purpose of temperance reform. If they wanted to make the anticipations of the enemies of the Bill true, they would put in a time limit, because, with that time limit, they would never get sufficient funds to enable them to carry out this measure of temperance reform. He saw from one of the numerous pamphlets which had been sent to him that in regard to the ante-1869 houses. which practically could not be dealt with at the present moment, it would take thirty years of this fund to get rid of them from the temperance point of view. He asked the Committee to consider that if they had this fund in perpetuity they would probably be able to raise money to get rid of the supernumerary houses in the first year. The scheme of the Bill was not to wait for thirty years. The scheme was that they might capitalise the sum required in order to bring about as soon as possible a great measure of temperance reform. The time limit made that absolutely impossible. He could not understand why the advocates of temperance wanted to mutilate a scheme of this sort, and make it a bad scheme, by crippling the compensation fund, which was really the basis of the whole question of temperance reform. He thought the real fact of the matter was that there was a prejudice, more or less openly avowed by the opponents of the Bill, against giving any compensation to the trade at all. They seemed not to realise that this compensation was not to be given from the public funds; it was simply a compulsory insurance provided by the trade itself. One could easily pick to pieces this provision, because there was not the slightest doubt that the houses to be shut first would be the worst, and the big hotels would have to contribute large amounts for compensation, whereas the risk of their being shut up would be very slight. The funds required to carry out this great scheme of temperance reform could not be raised without a perpetuity tax on which to raise a sufficient capital sum in the first instance to enable the local authorities to get rid of unnecessary licences. He could not understand why the advocates of temperance reform opposite wanted to mutilate a Bill of this sort. The fact was that there was a prejudice more or less openly avowed by the opponents of the Bill against giving any compensation to the trade at all. He appealed to Gentlemen who were anxious for temperance reform to see what they were doing. They were reducing the amount to be obtained for granting compensation for the reduction of the unnecessary licences. The question of freehold had nothing whatever to do with compensation. If anyone could show that the compensation to be given under the scheme of the Bill would be on the scale of a freehold, he would be the first to oppose it. The time limit would only introduce confusion, create great difficulties as far as the magistrates were concerned, and cripple the funds necessary to advance the desires of the temperance reformers.

MR. HALDANE said he had listened to the speech of the hon. and learned Gentleman who had just sat down, and he confessed that his argument a little puzzled him. The position of the hon. Gentleman was that unless a tenure of a perpetuity character were given, there would not be any capitalised source of income from which to proceed with the work of reform.

MR. CRIPPS: No sufficient capital.

MR. HALDANE said that that meant that it was of the essence of the Bill to give a perpetuity tenure to a very large number of licences. That would be so. Now the Committee knew where they stood, and he contended that it would be perfectly impossible, under the scheme of the Bill, for any effective work to be done in reducing the number of public-houses. The hon. and learned Member was not contemplating any considerable addition to existing licences. They could not have their cake and eat it at one and the same time. If the number of licences came down the fund for compensation would disappear. That meant that the operation of the Bill would be confined to comparatively small limits. The proper conception of the use of a time limit was that it should lead to the general liquidation of the whole existing system. The existing licence-holders would have their title to consideration at the hands of the Legislature recognised, and would be given a certain time in which to recoup themselves for what they had expended in the purchase of their licences, but they would be warned that the character of their tenure, as laid down by the highest Court in the land, could not be altered. This Bill, however, did alter the tenure, and made the work of the temperance reformer one of enormously greater difficulty than before. Those of them who felt great misapprehension with regard to this Bill did so on more than one ground. It was not that they had any fanatical desire to use hardly people who were engaged in a trade which the law of the land had caused to grow up, and which was recognised as legitimate; but they felt that there were very great evils connected with that trade which ought to have been dealt with long ago; and that this measure, framed as it was, would make the work of the reformer enormously more difficult than it was before. His hon. friend the Member for the Spen Valley pointed out that not only one reform movement but every reform movement would be hampered. The Bill would create a new situation with which people would have to deal in the future; and it would be very difficult to apply remedies which could be applied comparatively easily without this Bill. They felt that the Bill blocked the avenue to further reform; and it was on that ground that they regarded it as a retrograde step, and that he ventured to express disagreement with the theory of his hon. and learned friend opposite, a theory which his hon. and learned friend regarded as a good theory, but which, to his mind, marked out the Bill as a step which was really retrograde, and one which would retard the cause of reform.

*MR DUKE (Plymouth) said that on the other side of the House there was a great readiness to put upon some future House of Commons or upon the justices at some future time the invidious task of abolishing licences without compensation. It was agreed that for to-day the ordinary principles of fair play and justice should apply, that they should not take away a licence to-day, some said within seven years, or as others said fourteen years, or as others again said twenty-one years, without giving something in lieu of the licence. He submitted, however, that the moral question which raised the real difficulty in this case would be the same whether it arose this year, or in seven years, or any other number of years time, and if the object of the Bill were really to provide a means for dealing with the greatest difficulty there was at the present time in the way of temperance reform, they would not serve it by making their measure of such a temporary character that it failed for the present to have any effective operation by reason of the trammels they put upon it, and in the future, and early future, would inflict upon everybody who remained in the trade what at present was felt to be a measure of injustice. The real question was what was to be done to liberate the conscience of the country from the fetters which had been put upon it in getting rid of the redundant supply of licensed houses at the present time. If there had been no difficulty of the kind, a difficulty not in point of law, but in point of morals and fair play, all these redundant public-houses would have ceased to exist. It was not because the justices of England were indisposed to get rid of them that the controversy arose. The cry of hon. Members on the opposite side of the House at the present time was, "Leave this matter to the unfettered discretion of the justices"; but the justices refused to take upon themselves the task of depriving fellow citizens of—whether they called it property or not—something which, in fact, belonged to them, and leaving them nothing in the place of it. This was the real difficulty, and how was it to be lessened in the least by the course proposed by hon. Members on the other side of the House.

The hon. Member for the Spen Valley had spoken of the course which would be taken during the period of his time limit. He said that within that period they would get rid of the undesirable houses and that they would get rid of them with compensation. But they would leave the whole number of the useful and deserving houses and, when the hon. Member's time limit had come into operation, they would get rid of them without compensation. Well, we had heard of equal treatment for the evil and the just, but we had never heard of meting out compensation to a less deserving claimant and keeping the more deserving claimant for the future when there was to be no compensation. The hon. Member proposed at the end of seven, fourteen, or twenty-one years to introduce some system of local veto, philanthropic management, or high licence, or one or other of those various panaceas which had been before the country as long as he had been conscious of anything having been before it, and which were, he had no doubt, in full blast before that, and which had always been rejected by the common sense of the people. If local veto had been a real and practical remedy for the difficulties of the problem, it had had a generation or a generation and a half to commend itself to the people of the country, and it was more recognised as a myth to-day than it was when it was discussed on every platform thirty or forty years ago. Why should this Bill be framed to work with a system of local veto? Then there was a new sort of idea of philanthropic management of public-houses. There was nothing at the present time to prevent every Bench of justices in the country from licensing public-houses to come into existence and be carried on under philanthropic management. It was another notion and figment of the imagination, and nobody dreamed that the philanthropic public-house was going to replace the commercial public-house.

Further there was the proposal of a high licence in lieu of the proposal of His Majesty's Government. He was not going to discuss it, but, in the form in which the hon. Member for the Spen Valley put it, it was a mere proposal for confiscation. The Bill ought not to be hampered with these projects. He submitted that the real difficulty was to find terms upon which they could prevent licence-holders who had embarked their capital in their business from continuing that business where there was no sort of moral complaint against them; and in his opinion His Majesty's Government had found fair terms in this Bill. If, however, fair terms had not been found in it, what would be thought of those proposed from the other side of the House, where they compensated the undeserving and penalised the deserving; and what would be thought of a system, if it were proposed by His Majesty's Government, under which for seven, fourteen, or twenty-one years a man paid compensation to licensees when it was desirable in the public interest to get rid of although, at the end of that period, his own property was to be extinguished without compensation? He desired to support the proposal of His Majesty's Government as a practical proposal which really introduced temperance reform at once, and did not postpone it until the hon. Member for the Spen Valley and his friends had persuaded the public to reconsider local option, and which was a proposal, upon the admission of those who criticised the measure, which would within a measurable time get rid of the class of houses of which it was to the interest of the public to get rid.

MR. MARKHAM (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield) complained that in the Bill not one single effort was made or would be made in the true interests of temperance. It could not be called a temperance measure at all, for it was nothing more nor less than a compensation Bill. He was wholly opposed to any time limit, and, therefore, he could not vote for either Amendment before the House. The publicans were only legitimately entitled to an annual interest in their licences. and therefore he proposed at a later stage to move an Amendment restricting his right to a year only. Since the case of "Sharpe *v.* Wakefield", in the district where he lived the value of licences had risen in many instances no less than 150 or 200 per cent. Where there was a commodity which cost something like 7d. and was retailed at something like 2s. to the general public—and that owing to the monopoly under which that beer was sold—speculative brewery companies came into the market and put up the price of the licences, well knowing what the law was and depending on Ministerialist Members to give them compensation. It had been a pure speculation on the part of the brewers, and now they came to Parliament and asked for full compensation for the value of the licences they had been speculating in, well knowing what the state of the law was. Now the Government absolutely refused to accept any time limit whatsoever, and those licences were to become freehold. Where the value of public-houses had been so enormously increased by speculative brewery companies it was wholly wrong that the House should compensate the brewers. His objection to the scheme was that it would not reduce licences to any material extent. He lived in a village where 4,500 gallons of beer were drunk every week, representing a sum of something like £400 a week, and he would like to know how the Bill was going to decrease drinking there? It would not touch that evil. The value of the houses was over £25,000. How were they going to deal with licences like that? They would not have the money to deal with them.

*MAJOR JAMESON (Clare, W.) said it appeared to him that very few Members grasped what this Amendment meant.

And, it being half-past Seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

LICENSING BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[MR. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 1:—

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 5, to insert, at the beginning, the words "During the period of seven years after the passing of this Act."—(*Mr. Ellis Griffith.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"To leave out the word 'seven' and insert the word 'fourteen.'"—(*Colonel Williams*).

Question again proposed, "That the word 'seven' stand part of the proposed Amendment."

*MAJOR JAMESON, continuing his speech, said, until the Amendment was moved, to make the time limit fourteen years, nobody in the House had any knowledge of what the reasons were for proposing a time limit. Then they were told that one reason was that compensation should not be granted at all, that compensation was not granted to shareholders in gold mines which did not happen to prosper, and that compensation should not be granted to those whose licences were suppressed. But he would point out that there could be any number of gold mines, while the number of public-houses was limited. He did not think the hon. Member for the Spen Valley could have been serious when he compared public-houses with gold mines. He could not understand the objection of the hon. Member to what was practically a perpetual fund raised for the purpose of securing that those public-houses which were superfluous should be done away with. Did the hon. Member mean that this time limit was required, or did he think that the end of all public-houses would come at the end of this time limit. At the end of fourteen years justice would be the same as to-day. It was only towards the end of the hon. Member's speech that the Committee discovered that the real reason for a time limit was their old friend local option which had been so often before the House, and which had been scouted by the House whenever it came before it. The hon. Gentleman should remember that whenever he had the power and had the people behind him he could always introduce local option. This Bill simply created a perpetual fund for the purpose of redeeming superfluous licences. Why should the Committee consider a time limit was necessary? If they desired to put a time limit on what was right and just then all he could say was that the temperance and Liberal Party was attempting to do a thing which they would not have thought of doing ten years ago. The Government by this Bill had given the Committee a chance of doing a great stroke for temperance reform; the magistrates had always had the power to deal with superfluous licences and the Government now came forward and said, "You always had the power to deal with licences, now here is this fund from which you may compensate the licence-holder; get along and get rid of all these superfluous licences." Why should it be said that there should be a time limit in which to compensate the man whose licence was suppressed. In Ireland, when all the superfluous licences had gone, it became the law that a man should not have his licence taken away unless he broke the law, and that should be the law here. It worked very well in Ireland. Those in favour of a time limit being introduced into this Bill seemed to have overlooked or forgotten the fact that this Bill practically stopped for ever the granting of any new licences. They appeared to forget that the money which passed as compensation to dispossessed licence-holders was only equivalent to the value of a new licence being paid for the surrender of an old licence. It was a most extraordinary argument to put forward that a Bill which practically prevented new licences being granted should only be in force for fourteen years and that it should then expire. This Bill, if passed into law, would deal with all the old 1869 beerhouse licences and bring them into line with the others, and he himself believed that the only reason why the temperance party were opposed to this Bill was that it was introduced by the present Government. He opposed the Amendment.

*MR. ROWLAND HUNT (Shropshire, Ludlow) said "time limit," in his opinion, was little more than a catchword, like "efficiency" and "free trade." Hon. Members seemed to forget that for many years it had been the custom of the justices to renew licences as a matter of course, and it would be admitted that the custom of the country continued for many years became to a great extent a law of itself. Licences had been renewed under this custom for a great number of years, and, in his opinion, it would be a very wrong thing indeed to take them away without giving the holders some compensation for them. With this time limit they were going to compel the trade to pay a large sum of money year after year, and at the end of the seven, fourteen, or twenty-one years, whichever was suggested. The remaining licence-holders would find that they had paid all this money and got nothing for it, and, in addition, could have their licences arbitrarily taken away. Even with local option he did not think the people of this country would be willing to subject these licence-holders to such unfair conditions. If they had a time limit they would be in a far worse position respecting the reduction of licences than they were at present. The only time limit which he felt they ought to recognise in the Bill was one which provided that no new licences should be granted to brewers. Brewers naturally tried to sell as much beer as they could, and consequently pressed the sale of their commodities at the public-houses controlled by them, and the English people were quite ready enough to drink alcholic liquors without extra inducements. What he should like to see was the prevention of the granting of new licences, except to associations similar to that of Lord Grey, which gave every opportunity to the people to be able to have good food and tea and coffee, as well as really good sound alcoholic liquors. He regarded the Bill as a real temperance reform, with nothing of grandmotherly legislation about it, and if this proposal could be inserted in the measure he believed it would be a thoroughly good one.

SIR JOHN GORST said the Amendment was one of which he heartily disapproved. It put a time limit on the operation of the first clause of the Bill, which was a clause chiefly relating to the machinery under which licences should be granted. The Committee did not yet know what particular form Clause 1 was likely to assume, and under those circumstances it appeared to him to be a somewhat foolish thing to put a limit to machinery the precise nature of which was not yet determined. It would be far better for the Committee to set up proper machinery for granting licences and not to enact that this Bill should not last more than seven years, the only result of which would be that it would, as everybody knew perfectly well, be put into the Expiring Laws Continuance Bill at the end of each session, and go on year after year, but if the clause was passed as it now stood and the House found it necessary to amend the machinery, it could be easily amended. There was nothing, therefore, to be said in favour of the particular Amendment before the Committee. But when they came to a time limit up to which compensation was to be paid out of this Bill, then he did not agree that this was an attempt on the part of those who advocated a time limit to deal with the licence-holders in an unfair manner. The situation was this. It was admitted by everybody that there was no legal right to compensation, but owing to the weakness of the authorities there had grown up a custom of renewing licences, which had created in them some value, and it was thought to be a hard thing to take away a licence from a man without compensating him for his loss, and for his own part he thought it was better that they should buy back the right to deal with licences in the interest of the public.

The main question was how much compensation was to be given, and in what form was it to be given. All were agreed that there must be compensation, but not as to the amount, and under this Bill it was very difficult to estimate the amount. It had been stated by the hon. and learned Member for the Stretford Division that in his long experience he had never known a case in which more than ten years purchase was given for a licence in compensation cases. Would the Government say whether that was the meaning of the clause? If it was not, would they make the clause bear that interpretation? Because undoubtedly the trade itself—the brewers—put upon the Bill a very different interpretation to that which was put upon it by the hon. and learned Member for Stretford. The brewers, at any rate, expected to be compensated on a very different computation. If compensation was to be quite just to the custom that had grown up, it was perfectly certain that the value of the property should neither be raised nor depreciated by this Bill, but what had been the result? This was the kind of property which could be estimated in the gross, because it was admitted that 85 per cent. of the public-house licences were in the hands of brewery and distillery companies, by the quotations on the Stock Exchange. A friend of his had been good enough to make out an estimate of the value of all the ordinary stocks and shares of the brewery and distillery companies quoted on the Stock Exchange before and after the introduction of the Bill. On 1st March, 1904, before the introduction of the Bill, the value of these ordinary stocks and shares was £24,629,000; on 1st June last the value of this same property was £25,812,000, an increase of about £1,200,000, or nearly 5 per cent. It was quite true that during the interval gilt-edged securities had considerably appreciated, but these were not gilt-edged securities, they were ordinary stocks and shares; such a thing might account for a rise in debentures, but not in ordinary stock. Consols had not risen 5 per cent. What had caused that rise? The introduction of the Bill; and no doubt when the Bill passed into law the rise would be greater still. That was what induced many people to think that the brewers and distillers were securing under the Bill, not only adequate and legitimate compensation for what they were asked to give up, but something more. The object of a time limit was to make a bargain now as to how much the so-called rights and equities of the publicans were worth and to make them a present of it. Some said that the value of a licence was ten years purchase; others said it was fourteen years, and others again said it was twenty years. He was not qualified to say which was the legitimate period, but whatever number of years purchase it was, let Parliament endow the publicans at once with the right to have that number of years purchase, and then as time went on compensate any owner of a licence whose licence was taken away for any reason other than misconduct, by giving him the value of the residue of that period. No one would be damnified by such a course, and at the end of the period the nation would be entitled to resume control of all licences, and the way would be open for the adoption of such system of temperance reform as the advanced opinion of the time suggested, by which the terrible sale of drink would be reduced. Such a scheme could not be described even by brewery and distillery owners as anything but fair and equitable, and it would restore to the public the power they had now lost, possibly through the laches of the licensing justices, of dealing annually, triennially, or quinquennially, with the licences according to the interests not of the holders, but of the public at large. The Bill appeared to provide for a new monopoly from the time new licences were granted—a monopoly that was to be put up to auction and sold to the highest bidder. That, in his opinion, was the most pernicious method of dealing with new licences that could possibly be devised, and later clauses of the Bill would have to be carefully considered. In the meantime, he failed to see anything unjust in such a time limit as he had described, and he greatly regretted that the curious manner in which the Rules of the House had operated would prevent Members from expressing by their votes their opinions in favour of a time limit.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS said he concurred generally in the broad theory laid down by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridge University. With regard to the particular Amendment before the Committee, whatever might be its effect upon the future working of the licensing system in England generally, Wales was especially interested in the question. His view was that the question of compensation was one for the settlement of those financially interested in the licences, though he agreed as to the advisability of supporting a scheme of compensation which would have the effect of facilitating the reduction of licences, such compensation to be levied on the trade and to have a distinct limit. The Licensing Commission, of which he had the honour of being a member, considered every phase of the time limit question, and, in the chairman's Report, there was recommended a scheme of compensation the dominant conditions of which were that it should not in any way interfere with the discretion of magistrates, that it should have the effect of reducing the number of licences to a statutory maximum, and that there should be a time limit. There was also an addendum to the effect that, having regard to the special position of the Principality, at the end of seven years Wales should have a large measure of popular control. Doubtless the opinion of the country as a whole was not ripe for such a settlement of the question, but, judged by every possible test, the popular feeling in Wales was overwhelmingly in favour of giving the Principality a large measure of popular control over licences; and, unless the Amendment were adopted, that settlement of the licensing question on those lines, so far as Wales was concerned, would be shut out for a great many years. That being so, the Committee could not be surprised that it was the determination of Welsh Members to do their utmost to secure the Amendment of the Bill in this particular. Many circumstances in connection with licensing administration made the Amendment of especial importance to Wales. There was the question of the relation of the magistrates to the general opinion of the country, and also that of the somewhat exceptional position occupied by quarter sessions. Moreover, it must be evident that any scheme of compensation must be in the way of experiment, and, therefore, it was necessary that a time limit should be introduced. Public opinion altered, and in ten or fifteen years there might be a totally different situation. The operation of the Bill would be to reduce the number of licences and enhance the value of those that remained. These, he contended, were strong reasons for the insertion of a time limit. He hoped this question would not be settled entirely on Party considerations. He had always pleaded that in the settlement of important questions directly concerning the welfare of the community at large Party differences should be as far as possible forgotten, and the interests of the public alone considered, and he hoped that that course would be followed upon the present occasion.

SIR FREDERICK BANBURY (Camberwell, Peckham) thought the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridge University had made a mistake in confining the rise in value of stocks to which he had referred to brewery shares and gilt-edged securities, because in the period mentioned by the right hon. Gentleman there had generally been a considerable rise in English securities quoted on the Stock Exchange. As to the argument that the absence of a time limit would convert an insecure tenure, dependent upon the caprice or judgment of a Bench of magistrates, into a freehold, that was disproved by the right hon. Gentleman himself, because, if the value in brewery shares had been increased by 5 per cent., that meant that a house formerly worth £5,000 was now worth an additional £250, an infinitesimal increase which certainly did not represent the difference between an insecure tenure and a freehold. Hon. Members opposite seemed to have enhanced value of licences on the brain. He did not believe that temperance reform would be either encouraged or discouraged simply because somebody was going to get a little more for his property, but hon. Members by their arguments in support of the Amendment seemed more anxious to prevent publicans getting some increase in the value of their property than to promote the cause of temperance. The fear had also been expressed that public-house associations, such as Lord Grey's Trust, would not be encouraged, and that consequently the profits of the trade would continue to go to private individuals. What had that to do with the cause of temperance? Surely private individuals had as much right as anybody else to make profits, and if it ever became the intention of Parliament to prevent their so doing he would be sorry for the future of the country.

*MR. EMMOTT said the hon. Baronet the Member for Peckham did not seem to grasp the elementary considerations which influenced Members on the Opposition side who were not fanatical teetotalers but who believed that there was a system to which they ought to approximate and work, and that that system was the elimination of private property without anything in the way of confiscation. There were two views in regard to licences—either they must keep to the present system under which the whole of the profit went to private individuals who were granted a monopoly under certain conditions; or they must have a system by which the interest in the sale of drink and the profits from the sale of drink should not belong to private individuals at all. If they were to have a perfect system of licences—perhaps it might be a long time before they got it—it must be a system in which no single person was interested in increasing the sale of drink for his own private profit. It was because this Bill was drawn without a time limit, and must make temperance reform more difficult, that they were anxious to introduce a time limit. The Prime Minister had deplored the system of monopoly in the drink traffic which at present existed. This Bill riveted that monopoly upon the neck of the public for an indefinite time, and that was why the Opposition strongly objected to it. It gave—whether they called it a freehold or not—something like perpetuity of tenure to the present holders of licences subject only to their being dispossessed on payment of full compensation. To those who believed that it was desirable to get rid of the present monopoly, the elimination of private property seemed necessary. On this question the Bill was on the wrong line, and presented a permanent block to those who wished to approach the question from the point of view of public interest alone. The only way to avoid that in a Bill drawn like the present was to introduce the time limit for which they were now pleading—the system of a time limit plus compensation for those dispossessed during the period of that limit.

With regard to the equity of the case, surely the idea of a time limit was an equitable compromise under present conditions. The present system was that no licence need be renewed if the magistrates did not desire to renew it. But the present practice, on the other hand, was that only three houses out of every 1,000 were on the average suppressed in a year. The time limit with compensation seemed to him to be an equitable compromise for the actual position in which they found themselves. What was the value of a licence? The hon. and learned Member for the Stretford Division had told them that the actual value of a licence was not what it would be if it were a freehold at all, but at least ten or twelve years purchase. Therefore he contended that for that a reasonable time limit—ten, twelve, fourteen, or he would give even more years in order to settle the question—would meet the equity of the case. With regard to the question of expediency the Prime Minister had said it would be unwise to introduce a time limit because the justices would not be able to borrow, and at once to expropriate a large number of licences. He believed it was the hon. and learned Member for the Stretford Division who said that if only they capitalised the annual sum that Manchester would receive under this Bill, they could at once diminish the number of licences in Manchester to the scale recommended by the Minority Report of the Royal Commission.

But the hon. and learned Member forgot to point out that if such a course were adopted the number of licences then remaining in Manchester would be stereotyped for all time, and must remain whether the people wished it or not. Then with regard to expediency and equity, the Prime Minister had raised the question of the double insurance. He (Mr. Emmott) thought the double insurance could be managed by a trade which had been so enormously profitable as had the liquor trade during the last twenty or thirty years.

But they were told the insecurity of the present system was such—an insecurity which would be intensified if a time limit were introduced—that no respectable man would undertake the trade of a publican. Where did the real insecurity of tenure of the public-houses exist? Did it exist in free houses or in tied houses? Everyone who had studied the question even in the most elementary way knew that the tenants of tied houses remained a far shorter time than the tenants of free houses. He had seen the figures in regard to Leeds. Out of 379 tied houses in Leeds there were during the year 165 transfers, whereas out of 788 free houses there were only 109 transfers. What about the security of tenure there? It was a matter of common report that some owners of tied houses actually encouraged changes of tenants because they believed that by bringing in a new tenant they would bring in a new *clientele* without losing the old one. Insecurity of tenure did not arise from the present licensing system except so far as it had been with the system of tied houses, the existence of which many Members deplored. The Bill did nothing whatever to remedy the system of tied houses, at any rate it did not alter it for the better. The reason why he pleaded so strongly for this Amendment was that if a time limit were introduced they could deal with the question again *de novo* when the time limit had expired. Then they would have had more experience and they would be able to tell upon what line they could most equitably advance. He felt sure that this course would be for the benefit of the temperance cause. His hon. friend the Member for the Spen Valley Division said that if this Bill was passed without a time limit, the Liberal Party, when it came into office and desired to deal with this question, would be forced to look for some direction in which to deal with the question in a satisfactory way. What direction would be left? First and principally the high tax. If the licensed houses in London paid the same taxes which they paid in New York then they would pay ten times as much as they were asked to pay to-day. He did not like the high-tax system at all, and he preferred a gradual approach in the direction of eliminating private profit from the trade. If they passed this Bill without a time limit they would put an absolute block in the way of any temperance reform in the future.

Lord HUGH CECIL (Greenwich) said he ventured to address the Committee on this occasion with some diffidence, but he hoped with more brevity than had been shown in some of the very able speeches to which they had listened. He did not pretend to be able to exhaust the whole of the subjects which had been brought under review during the discussion of this Amendment. He noticed that the hon. Member for Spen Valley, in a very interesting speech, developed all kinds of theories, many of which to him appeared to go beyond the scope, not merely of this Amendment, but even of this Bill. The hon. Member for Spen Valley had conceded that there was something which belonged to the licensees which was not property, to which they had no legal right, and to which they had no moral right, but which he was prepared to pay them money for out of grace.

Mr. WHITTAKER: I said I was willing to arrange that they should pay one another.

Lord HUGH CECIL said he understood the hon. Member's theory was that they were not morally entitled to anything.

Mr. WHITTAKER: From us.

Lord HUGH CECIL: From no one. They were entitled of grace, which the hon. Member distinguished from morality. He thought the distinction was unsound. When Portia said that the quality of mercy was not strained, she certainly did not intend to imply that there was no moral claim upon Shylock. At any rate, the hon. Member conceded that there was something—and it did not really matter what they called it—which was worth money; and what they had to determine was not what the publicans had a right to, but what it was the duty of the community to see that they got. It seemed to him it would be unfair for them to require that persons who were pursuing a trade which they had always assumed was an honest trade should be deprived in a larger measure than heretofore of something which was admittedly worth money. The hon. Member went on to say that he did not believe that security of property made any improvement in the management of public-houses. He confessed that that seemed to him to be one of those propositions which had an interesting bearing beyond the scope of this Bill, and he should like to know how the hon. Member would apply that proposition to land reform. Did the hon. Member mean that fixity of tenure which was given to the Irish tenants had not improved the cultivation of the land? He thought the Chief Secretary for Ireland might take a hint from this argument, for there were many points strikingly illustrated by it. Contrast how the Irish tenant, who had no legal right at all, had been treated in the controversy with his landlord and the way it was proposed the holders of licences should be treated in respect of the State. The Ulster tenant, for example, before 1881 had a thing called tenant right which was worth money. Was that a moral right, or a legal right, or an equitable claim, or something which deserved compensation by grace or favour? It was evident that the real question was whether, as a matter of fact, the licence-holders would feel aggrieved and, according to the general standard of morality of the community, ought to feel aggrieved. He thought it had always been admitted that if a person had fixity of tenure he managed things better and made more improvements than if he was simply a tenant at will. That was the view of the hon. Member for Oldham, who maintained that this Bill would add to the security and implied that if it did it would have an increased claim upon his support.

His right hon. friend the Member for Cambridge University developed, with characteristic force and lucidity, a very interesting theory as to the proper manner of dealing with licences. He, too, admitted that there was a something which the State ought to compensate; but he said that that might be compensated by giving something to the whole class of licensees, a something which was to diminish year by year and finally expire at the end of the time limit. That might or might not be a just way of dealing with the subject, but it was not in the least within the scope of the Bill. The Bill did not buy out anybody or anything. What the State did was to insist on the members of the trade themselves paying a certain amount of compensation to the particular individuals who, in the interest of the community generally, were compelled to abandon their licences. He had always thought that the Bill might be criticised with some severity from the point of view of the trade, on the ground that the compensation was not really paid by the State at all, but by the trade itself. But, whatever might be the force of his arguments, it was evident that the case of his right hon. friend did not really arise. If a time limit were introduced the persons engaged in the trade would suffer under this unfair disadvantage. They would pay their share of compensation which was paid to particular individuals during the duration of the time limit and they would afterwards have no security of tenure at all themselves. Therefore, they would, as it were, suffer twice over.

But the real argument he was anxious to put before the Committee was the argument of duty, which, undoubtedly, was at the bottom of the great mass of demand for a time limit outside that House. An enormous number of people said "We do not mind this Bill unless it ties our hands for the future." He apprehended that the great mass of the Church of England temperance opposition to the Bill, as far as they were opposed to it, was upon those lines; but it seemed to him that it rested on a misconception of what the principle of the Bill was and what the Bill did. He did not think it tied the hands of any temperance reformer in the least. He thought it only put into an Act of Parliament what every Member on that side of the House, and not a few on the other side, had always recognised as an equitable doctrine. This Bill did not stand in the way of municipalising the trade or of doing anything which the House of Commons might think was fair and just. The Bill did not say, it did not imply, that they were not to take away licences, after a period, with notice. The only principle involved in the Bill was that the licence was not to be taken away without notice and without compensation. It did not go an inch beyond that. It would be quite competent for the hon. Member for Spen Valley to bring in a Bill declaring that at some future date, say twenty or thirty years hence, every licence should cease in the country. This Bill did not deal with that question at all but it dealt with what were to be the rights of magistrates under the existing law as to refusing licences without compensation. It did not interfere in the least with the future right of Parliament to set up whatever time limit it might think proper under which licences might cease altogether and after due notice given. And why was that not fair? If they set up a certain limit which every licence-holder in the country knew, and at the end of which his right as a licensed victualler came to an end, he made his arrangements. If the time was long and reasonable enough, he was enabled to get back all the capital he had put into the business, and he would go out without losing a penny. But if they were going to have in the future a system of refusing licences from year to year, they maintained the element of uncertainty; and it was precisely that element of uncertainty which occasioned the unfairness. It was because people did not know what they had to expect that they were not able to make their arrangements.

What their real object should be was to carry some measure of reform without inflicting hardship on any class of the community; and, if the circumstance of hardship remained, the licensed victuallers would still have the moral ground of complaint that they had against the discretionary refusal of the magistrates at the present time. It seemed to him that the House would have its hands as much untied in the future as in the past; but, in any case, could anything be more unskilful or unwise in legislation than to set up a time limit for the future and not to introduce into the Bill a plan for what they were going to do when the time limit came to an end? What a state of chaos would be introduced. The Committee knew very well how time limits operated, for they had had experience of that kind with regard to Irish land, for every fifteen years the land system in Ireland was turned upside down. Was the whole trade to be upset every fourteen or fifteen years because no one knew how Parliament was going to deal with this discretionary power of the magistrates? If there was no plan, at any rate which this Parliament could accept, why burden the Bill with a time limit which gave them nothing whatever, which was not in any respect necessary, but merely aggravated the sense of uncertainty and doubt for the future? The only way of dealing with the subject was to pass this Bill as it stood. Then, if public opinion developed and they saw a way of dealing with the question, nothing in this Bill would stop it. But do not let them interfere with the operation of this Bill, which was really a small and modest proposal, and merely designed to get over the present critical situation under which one bench of magistrates adopted one system and another bench a different system in dealing with licences. He believed that, if the critics outside the House would accept the view that this Bill was only intended to meet the exigency which had arisen in quite recent times owing to the action of a few benches of magistrates, and not fundamentally to alter or revolutionise the licensing system of the country the opposition to it would be very much diminished. He was certain that the great cause of temperance was not advanced by those who threatened to kill a cat by some other way than hanging it.

MR. ROBSON (South Shields) said the Committee were indebted to the noble Lord opposite for the admirable and lucid speech he had just delivered. A great politican and philosopher once said that all political problems were questions of morals. He thought the noble Lord opposite had failed to realise that this was in a large measure a question of morals. He invited the Committee to look at some of the moral elements involved. He did not think there could be any doubt as to the existing right of the licensee, because his existing legal right was expressed every time they used the word "licence." The word "licence" had been used as though it were a property going beyond the year for which it was granted. It had been admitted that a licence was an interest which existed only for a year, and at the end of that year what was the duty of the community in regard to a licence? It was the duty of the community to consider whether, at the end of each year, it was necessary that a licence should be renewed. If the magistrates were of opinion that for any reason whatever the number of licences had become in excess of the legitimate demand of the population, it was not merely their right to refuse a renewal of any licence, but it was their duty. He knew no kind of judicial discretion or right which was not in proper circumstances a duty. No representative of the community was entrusted with rights unless in proper circumstances he performed the duty of exercising those rights. This Bill proposed to put a prohibitory limit on the exercise of a public duty. It seemed to him that those hon. Members who had taken part in this discussion had not considered the question sufficiently from that point of view.

What did the history of licensing show? If they traced it from its earliest days they would find how readily it had conformed to public opinion upon the question of temperance. In the latter part of the eighteenth century the design of the Government was to raise money by increasing the consumption of spirituous liquors, and an evil state of things was brought about. What would have been the condition of things to-day if the magistrates had not become alive to their duty with regard to the then existing state of things? There was no question of right in those days when the magistrates came to the conclusion that it was necessary to diminish the number of gin shops. There was no question of compensation then, and they put the licences upon a proper footing. The licences had been granted in the public interest, and it became a paramount interest to diminish them and the magistrates acted accordingly, and as soon as the great stress on the Revenue was taken off the licences were everywhere diminished with results extremely beneficial to the community. This Bill was deliberately designed to prevent the magistrates from exercising that duty and performing it freely without impediment according to the existing state of public opinion. The noble Lord's argument seemed to imply that they should prevent the magistrates from performing that which was their principal duty. The noble Lord also said that nothing so improved an industry as fixity of tenure; but that argument seemed to point to the conclusion that the whole system of annual licences was wrong, and that licences should be made freeholds. The third point raised by the noble Lord was undoubtedly expounded in a way that created an impression upon the House. That point was that the noble Lord thought the Bill did not tie the hands of any future Parliament. The noble Lord seemed to regard it as a misconception on that side of the House to suppose that this Bill would limit the discretion of Parliament in dealing with licences hereafter. If that were so undoubtedly this Bill would meet with much less opposition. If it were really the case that in the next Parliament or next session they would be at liberty to propose a time limit and that the Bill did not tie the hands of Parliament, many hon. Members would not be so anxious for the result of the division. The Bill prevented the unconditional control of the magistrates. According to the law of England the magistrates had hitherto the right to refuse the renewal of a licence without cause shown. They would no longer be able to act on that uncontrolled discretion. What had the publican had up to now? A licence with a strong reasonable hope of renewal. It was only a hope, though it was a hope which had a market value, and it depended on the exercise of a discretion by a particular body. It was unreasonable, inequitable, and unfair, to deprive that body of the discretion with which it had been entrusted in the public interest.

Apparently it seemed to shock more or less the moral sense of some hon. Members opposite to put in any kind of limit whatever. One Member after another had said that the same difficulty would be found at the end of the time limit. He asked the Committee to consider what that involved. A publican approched the justices for a licence and they said to him that they would give him a licence for one year, or five, six, seven, or fourteen years. But if the magistrates said to him, "Remember at the end of fourteen years we will not renew the licence," and then, when the time limit expired, he approached the magistrates and asked a renewal of his licence, was he to be supported in telling them that it was inequitable, unfair, and bad morals that they should keep their word and refuse the licence. The question had been treated on the other side as if the publicans had a permanent right of property in their licences. He would like to hear some definite declaration from some member of the Government as to what their view on this question of freehold in a licence was. He was somewhat puzzled why it was that they had not heard it from the Home Secretary, who was in charge of the Bill, or from the Solicitor-General, who was in charge of the Home Secretary. They were dealing now with the most vital point in the Bill, and he now thought they ought to hear from some member of the Government what in their opinion was the true state of the existing law in regard to licences. The learned Solicitor-General had said that there was something corresponding to a freehold, and that had been vigorously combated by the Prime Minister and his hon. and learned friend the Member for the Stretford Division. Ten years would be a very high scale of compensation in the case of a public-house taken under the Land Clauses Act. The licence was treated as having an element of risk in it, and the Government desired that it should continue on that footing, for the compensation was not to be assessed on the freehold value, but on the value of the house as it would have been if this Bill had not passed; in other words, the licence was subject to determination at the will of the local magistrates. They admitted that the licensee had no property rights, but only a moral expectation to which the community itself might in its own interest put an end whenever it thought fit. A great right of public control was to be hampered and practically prohibited. That was the reply to the noble Lord who said the Bill would not tie their hands in the future. The instinct for reform, the desire for temperance, would be more than handicapped if the Bill passed, and he begged the Committee to consider this proposal carefully and well.

MR. AUSTIN TAYLOR (Liverpool, E. Toxteth) said he was surprised to hear the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich say, if he understood him correctly, that the present position of the licensed trade and the situation which had led to the introduction of this Bill was that the monopoly of the licensed trade had been more or less threatened by the action of the magistrates in the exercise of their discretion. This Bill clearly stopped the magistrates from further dealing in their absolute discretion with licences, and imposed the limitation that they should take away no licence without paying compensation from a strictly limited fund. The noble Lord had said that this was merely a temporary expedient to reduce the magistrates to a sense of their duty, and that there was nothing to prevent Parliament from passing a measure under which all licences should terminate at the end of a certain period. He would welcome that declaration very much more from a member of the Government than from his noble friend. Certainly he had heard no indications of that kind from the Front Bench, and he should be extremely surprised to learn from any speech members of the Government might make that any ideas of that kind were floating in their minds. He confessed he did not understand why his noble friend was so inconsistent on the point as to say that, while it was perfectly legitimate to pass a general law bringing about the absolute termination of licences, he was entirely adverse to saying exactly the same thing within the four corners of this Bill. Although there might be certain difficulties about uniting the two ideas of paying compensation and the termination of licences on a time limit, yet if his noble friend was prepared to contemplate both ideas in different Bills, he could not conceive that it was beyond the ingenuity of the Front Bench to combine them together in this Bill. He felt, and he was sure that many others on that side of the House felt, the very greatest difficulty in regard to the question of a time limit, and particularly the difficulty of including it in this measure. Those who desired, as he did very strongly, to deal fairly with a trade which had been led to expect the renewal of its licences, subject, of course, to good conduct, felt at the same time a sense of duty to the community which forbade them to welcome or endorse a Bill which closed the door to future measures of temperance reform. Under the existing system, by which the magistrates had an absolute discretion over redundant licences, there was a control over the trade which the passing of this Bill would inevitably tend to weaken, and while, perhaps, that was an inevitable consequence of any Bill which conferred the right of compensation upon the individual licensee, those who desired to see the cause of temperance advance must recognise the necessity for a review of the condition of affairs at the expiration of some definite period of years. A time limit of seven years was wholly unacceptable to those on that side of the House who desired to deal fairly with the question. For his part, he suggested twenty years as a fair term for which to fix the limit, but an Amendment had been moved to convert seven years into fourteen, and that had his support. If it was not possible for those opposite to accept some modification of the extremely narrow term of years suggested in the Amendment of the hon. Member for Anglesey, he feared it would be impossible for many on that side of the House to support them by their votes.

*MR. WORSLEY-TAYLOR (Lancashire, Blackpool) said he proposed to confine himself to the question whether there should be a time limit introduced into the Bill at all. There were two tests which ought to be applied to any proposition of this kind. The first was—Is it consistent with the public interest? and the second was—Is it consistent with justice to the individual? If it did not fulfil both of these conditions then the proposition must be rejected by the House. He thought the proposal of a time limit sinned against both, and he, therefore, must record his vote against it. He was not, however, like his hon. friend the Member for the Toxteth Division enamoured of the existing state of things. There ought to be a considerable reduction in the number of licensed houses, and this was the opinion of the country, but various schemes to bring this about had failed. Justices desirous of reducing the number of public-houses had got the owners together in different towns, and had tried to get them to agree on schemes of compensation among themselves. That had failed. There had been a system of insurance by public companies, and that had failed. There had been the system of mere suppression, and that had failed because the conscience of the country had risen against it. In his own personal experience in the last three years as an executor he had known the estate duties levied, not on ten years, but on twenty years purchase, and under conditions of that kind justices would not agree to confiscate such property, for that was what it would amount to. Everybody was dissatisfied with the present state of things, and was seeking for a remedy.

The want of compensation had been the fatal stumbling-block in the way of the reduction of licences. It was that difficulty, together with the absence of control over the ante-1869 houses, that this Bill of the Government would remedy. Hon. Members opposite had used such expressions as that the Bill would "tie the hands" of the authorities, and that there would be "no effective reduction of licences," and that the Bill "would make reform more difficult." But would it? [Cries of "No," and "Yes."] He would apply the test of the figures the hon. Member for Oldham had given just now. He had said that in the present state of things the total number of reductions was three per 1,000, and as there were about 100,000 licences that meant a reduction of 300 in a year? That, he presumed, included reduction for all causes, misconduct, unsuitability, and so on; therefore the reductions on the ground of non-requirement would be less still. What did the Bill make possible? According to the latest figures they had an annual return of the compensation fund of £1,200,000. In the majority of cases ante-1869 houses would be the first to go, as they most pressingly required reduction, and as they would be the cheapest to buy out, and it was over the mark to put a considerable number of them at £1,000 apiece. So that the immediate result of this Bill would be that the next year, after the compensation fund had been levied, something like 1,000 licences or more could be taken away, and steady reduction, more gradual no doubt, could continue year after year as long as it was necessary to take away licences on the ground of redundancy. How, then, was it possible to justify such expressions as hon. Members opposite had used? And that would be done without a shilling of expense to the country! That was not his idea of creating a vested interest in the trade; on the contrary, it would make it more easy and simple and less costly to dispossess larger numbers of houses which were not in accordance with the public interest. Why was it necessary to put a time limit to beneficent action of that kind?

And if there were a time limit what was to happen at the end of it? At present a block existed, of which every one on both sides complained. Was that the *status quo* to which they were to revert? What would be the effect of the tenant coming before the justices and pleading that for seven or fourteen years he had been paying to the compensation fund a sum which appeared to him roughly about 15 per cent. on the annual value of his house in order to compensate people whose houses were not so well conducted? Would not the justices be likely to consider the strength of that plea? Every one who voted for a time limit would vote deliberately for increasing the difficulty which now existed. What would reversion to the *status quo* mean in the case of the ante-1869 houses? Were they going to put a provision in the Bill by which at the end of the time limit what were left of those houses should again enjoy their present immunity from control? Did any hon. Member opposite desire that? The alternative was even worse. Every man who had invested his money in an ante-1869 house had done so on the faith of the statute, which said that so long as the house was well conducted he should be absolutely irremovable on the ground of non-requirement. Could anybody say that it was right to induce those people to come into this general scheme, to deprive them of their *status* of irremovability, ask them to contribute to this fund for seven or fourteen years, and then to turn round and confiscate their licences at the end of that period? A more monstrous piece of robbery had never been proposed. This time limit would be a time limit to the usefulness and justice of the Bill, and for the reasons he had stated he intended to oppose it.

Sir EDWARD GREY said the hon. and learned Member who had just sat down had made a great point of the difficulty which would be created, if this Amendment were carried, in dealing with the 1869 beerhouses. In his opinion the 1869 beerhouses were really a small matter in the whole question of temperance reform. [Ministerial cries of "No."] What proportion were they to the whole? [Ministerial cries of "One-third."] One-third of the value of the whole trade? [Ministerial cries of "One-third of the total number."] If the value was not the important question, then the question of compensation became comparatively insignificant. There were two classes of these beerhouse licences—off and on—and the off-licences were abolished without a word of protest in the ordinary course of public legislation. If the community resumed the free control, which they ought never to have lost, of the whole licensing system, the position of the 1869 beerhouses would not be a real obstacle to complete reform. The main argument of the hon. and learned Member, persuasive as it sounded, was not, he thought really persuasive to the Committee, because it was based on an assumption which was diametrically opposed to the views of the majority of temperance reformers—namely, that our existing system of licensing was a thoroughly bad one and must be changed. The hon. and learned Member assumed that the existing system could never be changed; that it must go on, and that all that those who were looking to temperance reform could do was to get control of the existing system which could never be got rid of. The existing system was that of carrying on the liquor trade of the country for private profit, and there was not a word in the hon. and learned Member's argument to show that he contemplated that system's ever being changed. Regarding that system as being incapable of change, the hon. and learned Member said this Bill was the best they could possibly have. His objection to the Bill was that it made any change in the system impossible. They were told that a time limit was not suitable to the present Bill. No doubt that was because the Bill was solely adapted to the present system. It was a Bill to perpetuate the present system. The Amendment was intended to fix a date when the present system should come to an end. That was why there was so much opposition to the Amendment.

The noble Lord the Member for Greenwich pleaded for the Bill because it was such a little one. Would any Member of the Government endorse the noble Lord's interpretation of the Bill? The noble Lord contended that, supposing this Bill were passed, there would be nothing to prevent another Government from introducing a Bill with a time limit in it that might entirely change our licensing system; that it was a small Bill for carrying on, and might be prefaced by the words "So long as the existing system remains unchanged the justices shall act in a certain method." But there was nothing of that kind in the Bill; it was not that which had won the support of the trade for this Bill. The Bill had been interpreted by the trade as giving them a title which it would be beyond the power of Parliament to take away. The noble Lord had told them that the Bill did nothing of the kind. Until a member of the Government would tell them which was the correct view, it seemed to him that the noble Lord had no case, according to his own argument, for resisting this Amendment. This Bill meant goodbye to temperance reform of any other kind. It was because he believed that they would have no real temperance reform under this Bill that he wished the time limit to be introduced. The existing licences under the existing system more than covered the ground. If they were established by law and if reduction were limited by this Bill, the ground would remained covered and there would be no room for the introduction of any other system. At the end of a time limit, progressive communities would be free to try other systems, such as local option and the public-house trust system and municipalisation. Without such experiment the best system could not be found, and during the time limit what injustice was imposed on the licence holders? All that they were entitled to was the existing practice, and not the law, on the part of the licensing authorities; and that they would have.

The noble Lord the Member for Greenwich compared the equitable claim of the licence holders to that of the Irish tenants. But when they talked of an equitable claim let them be quite clear that they compared like with like. The Irish tenant created his interest; while the licence holder had had his given to him by the State. That made all the difference. He was perfectly prepared to consider equity provided there were any prospect that the community would, after a reasonable time, resume its rights. The exact number of years of a time limit was a small circumstance in the great question of whether the community was ever to have its hands free. The prospects of temperance reform were never brighter if only they were given a chance. The hon. and learned Member said that the conscience of the country had risen against the action of the licensing authorities. It was the stirring of the conscience of the country that produced that action; and that action had produced this Bill. It was not a Bill to enable licences to be reduced, but a Bill to prevent licences from being reduced. Did any one suppose that this Bill would have been introduced but for the Prime Minister's speech of a year ago, and every one knew what was the origin of that speech. If the Bill were for a limited time, then the objections to it would largely disappear; but the trade only supported the Bill because it shut the door in the face of any other system. The trade was bound up with the sale of drink for private profit. There were two parties to this matter—the community and the trade. All were prepared to admit certain claims on behalf of the trade; but only on condition that in the long run the rights of the community were restored. This Bill would give away those rights; and the Government were to that extent guilty of a breach of trust.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. LYTTELTON, Warrick and Leamington) said that he should vote for the Amendment if he believed that the consequences which the right hon. Gentleman had set forth would ensue from the Bill. But he did not believe that the measure would arrest all future temperance reform. But they required to look rather closely at the Bill and see what its true character was before that proposition could be made out. He agreed that if it could be really said that the Bill stereotyped for all time the existing opinion with regard to temperance reform there would be a genuine objection to it. But the measure simply dealt with the state of facts which an experience of thirty years had proved—namely, that magistrates would not reduce licences as fast as many temperance reformers wished, because to do so would involve hardship and injustice on many persons. It was an injustice which stopped a reform which was dear to the hearts of many Members on both sides of the House. The Bill enabled justices without violating their sense of justice to reduce licences more rapidly and freely at the expense of the trade, whom it compelled to set up a system of compulsory mutual insurance and to pay compulsory premiums. The means adopted were analogous to the principle lying at the root of the Workmen's Compensation Act. The loss was diffused over the industry in which the individuals were engaged and not on the individual. The Bill enabled the justices to reduce licences without hardship; it diffused the loss resulting from reduction over the whole trade instead of making it fall inequitably and harshly on the individuals whose licences were taken away. He repudiated the idea that the Bill would stereotype all licences for the future, and denied that it deprived the people of the power of introducing licensing reform in the future. It would be competent for hon. Members opposite, notwithstanding this Bill, to institute some system of municipalisation or local option if the opinion of the country liked those reforms, combined with the granting of fair terms of compensation. If, on the other hand, hon. Members could persuade the people to favour spoilation without compensation in twenty years time there was nothing to prevent them. It would involve another Bill, but this Bill would not tie the hands of the country for all time. But hon. Members were now asking the House to postpone an act of confiscation. What was suggested from that point of view would, to his mind, be a gross injustice. What was worse was to attempt to subject those who entered into an insurance fund to what would be little less than spoliation. He could not see that that would be right or just from any point of view. Those who were in favour of that policy and wished to carry it into effect must get the public to agree with them and then they would find nothing in this Bill to prevent them.

The Bill simply provided facilities for the reduction of licences and for the creation of a compulsory insurance fund, and it avoided injustice by spreading the contribution to the fund over the whole of the trade. He therefore asked hon. Members to address themselves to this question. What was there in the Bill which imposed a fatal barrier to temperance reform? That was the whole point. [OPPOSITION ironical laughter.] Well, he did not think that any one disputed that the Bill would, under present circumstances, facilitate the reduction of licences. [OPPOSITION cries of "Oh," and MINISTERIAL cheers.] The hon. Members who had preceded him had not disputed that; on the contrary they had admitted that there would be a large reduction of licences. It had been estimated by Mr. Sidney Webb that the reduction in London alone would be 25 per cent. [OPPOSITION cries of "Oh," and an HON. MEMBER: Does that not mean if the contributions are continuous?] Of course there was to be no limit of time in the Bill; if there was a limit of time there would be an end of the fund. He had already pointed out the power which remained hereafter to revive the question, if the country was prepared for it. The arguments in favour of the Bill, as he had tried to state them, were, first, the reduction of licences; second, the removal of the great obstacle which at present existed to temperance reform—namely, the obstacle to the reduction of licences; third, the diffusion of the loss by spreading it over the trade, and, further, that the compulsory insurance would not interfere with future reforms. He could see nothing to prevent any future reform provided it were not a reform without compensation, which in the eyes of the Government meant confiscation, but a reform with compensation, which could always be fairly argued.

*MR. NUSSEY (Pontefract) said that the right hon. Gentleman who had just spoken practically admitted that this Bill created a vested interest, and gave the licensed holders something they did not possess at the present time. It would, therefore, be admitted that the Bill was a new obstacle to temperance reform, and would make a new present to the trade. The right hon. Gentleman was very careful not to define the nature of a licence at the present time. He treated it as a vested interest; but looking at the nature of a licence it was quite impossible to hold that view. A licence was not in any sense a freehold property. It could not be given away; it was limited as regarded time and restrictions, and in a great many other ways in which freehold property was not limited. From that point of view certainly a licence was not in the nature of a vested interest. From the legal point of view it was not in the nature of a vested interest or freehold property, according to the law as laid down in "Sharpe *v.* Wakefield". It was a question of the custom of renewal; and it seemed to him that when a licence holder came before a bench of magistrates and asked for the renewal of his licence, he was in very much the same position as a man whose lease had expired and who was asking his landlord to renew it. If the man was a good tenant, and if he paid his rent, the landlord would probably renew the lease. In the same way, the bench of magistrates would ascertain if the licence holder had conducted his business properly, and if he had the licence was again granted; but otherwise it was refused. The whole case for compensation was argued on the basis that the custom of renewal had existed almost from time immemorial. It was admitted on all hands that the licence holder could have no legal expectation; and if it were said that he had a good expectation that could only be because it was customary. As had been pointed out, an expectation in business could be sold if it were a hopeful and sanguine expectation. How much was the licence holder entitled to by way of compensation; how much was his expectation worth? It was worth much less than a freehold or a vested interest; but that it was worth something he was ready to admit. He thought it was worth something on the ground of expediency alone. It seemed to him to be a case of employer and employed. A man was employed from year to year, and when the employer wished to exercise his power to turn that man out, the case was put to him as one of hardship. Then the employer would say that he would give the man three months' extra notice so as to enable him to find a new situation. That was as much as could be expected by a licence holder whose licence was not to be renewed, so much compensation as would enable him to find some other equally good employment and to turn his attention to a new trade in which he would be in no worse position than he was before. The Minority Report recommended seven years; an hon. Gentleman opposite proposed fourteen years; he himself had also an Amendment on the subject. But whatever the length of the time limit was, at the expiration of it they would be face to face with a very grave position. A man would ask why his licence was taken away without compensation after the time limit, when it could have been taken the year before with compensation. He thought, however, there were several ways of meeting the difficulty. Depend upon it, at the end of any time limit they would be face to face with a very grave state of affairs. At the same time he was in favour of some time limit, because he thought it placed the whole question of the right to compensation on an entirely different basis, and did not regard a licence as either a vested interest or a freehold. For his part, he should certainly vote for the Amendment; and he sincerely hoped that the Government would see their way not to endow this wealthy trade with still greater wealth than they had already. Further, if the Bill were passed in its present form, it would place a barrier for ever against a great many schemes for temperance reform which he hoped the country would deal with in the future.

*Mr. BOUSFIELD (Hackney, N.) said he had an Amendment on the Paper, the object of which was to introduce a new clause to the effect that after the 31st December, 1904, the compensation fund should become, as it were, a private fund administered by a board elected by publicans, brewers, and others interested in the trade, which should have power to levy, collect, distribute, and manage the fund privately. In a sense, it might be called a time limit; and in another sense its object was to provide, after the Bill had done its work, that the machinery should remain, but in private hands. He wished to ask if that Amendment could be discussed apart from the present Amendment.

*The CHAIRMAN: I think the hon. Member will be precluded from raising his Amendment, assuming the Committee negatives the present Amendment, because that will mean that the Committee has decided that there shall be no time limit; and if there is to be no time limit, obviously the proposal of the hon. Member would be contrary to the decision of the Committee.

*Mr. BOUSFIELD said he was much obliged to the Chairman, and that being so he would shortly state the nature of his Amendment. He ventured to submit that his proposal would not make any difference in the machinery of the Bill, or in the security which those interested in the liquor trade would have. It would not make any difference in the power of magistrates to utilise the machinery of the Bill to diminish the number of licences, but he felt certain that as regarded public opinion it would make a very great difference indeed. He ventured to say it would be impossible to get out of the minds of a large section of the public the notion which existed that under this Bill the liquor trade would get something they had not got now—namely, a security of tenure, the value of which was measured by a very large sum of money, and which would be inimical to the interests of temperance. They had to meet under this Bill a state of things which in its essence was, after all. only temporary. They had to meet a demand by the magistrates and by the public behind the magistrates for a change of policy with reference to public-houses. For a great many years past the magistrates had not been doing their duty; and the public had not considered it the duty of magistrates to keep down the number of public-houses to the limit of public requirements. The consequence had been that public-houses had grown until their numbers were out of proportion to the requirements of the public; and that tended to the spread of intemperance in this country. A change had now come over public opinion, and a consequent change in the practice of the magistrates; and he ventured to think that the Government would have been justified in making compensation out of public funds instead of out of trade funds, because public opinion ought to pay something for the change which it demanded; and they ought not to change a policy, which was long established, without seeing that persons who suffered hardship thereby were compensated. The point he wished to make was, that the general necessity which had arisen only needed temporary machinery to meet it; and that they would not be justified in erecting any other than temporary machinery for the purpose. They now had hundreds of public-houses more than they ought to have in proportion to the population; and they were all agreed that there should be a steady diminution in their number until they got back to something like the right proportion. That necessarily involved some hardship, some compensation, and some special machinery. But it was hoped that within a certain number of years that machinery would practically have done its work; and that the number of public-houses would be reduced to a fair proportion in comparison with the population. There was not, however, the slightest doubt that when the number of public-houses was reduced to some fixed proportion, questions would be constantly cropping up as to whether there were too many public-houses in one locality, owing to a change in population, or too few in another. It seemed to him that the proper course was to use public machinery in order to grapple with the only difficulty they now had to grapple with—namely, to reduce the public-houses to a right proportion; and, after that, to put the machinery under private control. The fund could still be a compulsory fund; but it could be collected and managed by the trade, so that magistrates might have full and unfettered discretion after the expiration of a certain time to close any public-house they pleased, within certain limits, without any reference to the question of compensation, knowing full well that there would be compensation. The compensation being for the trade, that seemed to him to be a very hopeful solution of the question of the time limit and the other difficulties they had before them. There was a very widespread feeling in the country against making the machinery proposed in the Bill permanent. The object which the Government had in view would be achieved in a limited number of years. There was no necessity for permanent machinery; and his proposal would satisfy public sentiment, which was manifested very keenly day by day, against permanently restraining the discretion of the magistrates.

MR. ATHERLEY-JONES (Durham, N.W.) said they had heard from the right hon. Gentleman the Colonial Secretary a speech full of singular plausibility. The right hon. Gentlemen asked them to explain how they could, without committing injustice upon people who might be well-to-do or might be poor, take from them by legislation the licences which they at present enjoyed; and secondly, what injustice this Bill perpetrated in the way of preventing future legislation on the subject. The attitude of hon. Members on that side of the House had been admirably expressed by his hon. friend the Member for the Spen Valley. They regarded the position of the holders of licences from the proper legal standpoint as merely licensees; and they contended that this Bill entirely destroyed the legal position which, as licensees, they had occupied for a very long series of years. In other words, the Bill created a vested interest which never existed before; and by creating that vested interest they were preventing the Legislature from dealing with licences in the future, either by way of extinction, or by the reduction of their number, or by any other method which might act prejudicially to the present holders of licences. That was he answer to the right hon. Gentlemant. It was entirely begging the question, if he might say so, for the right hon. Gentleman to say that hon. Members on that side were proposing a sort of prospective confiscation. Prospective confiscation could only be made possible by the operation of the Bill. As the law stood, there could be no confiscation in refusing the renewal of a licence on any ground which the law at present provided; but the Bill put Parliament in this position, that whenever it dealt with licences in the future it would be not only morally but legally bound to compensate the holders of such licences. Without the operation of this Bill there need be no compensation, and what he wished to press on the Committee was, that not only from the legal standpoint merely, but also from the standpoint of practical experience and common sense there had never been any vested interest in the enjoyment of a licensed house. If ever there had grown up the idea among licensees that they had some vested interest, and that they had a moral right to the renewal of their licences, that was rudely shattered many years ago in the case of "Sharpe *v.* Wakefield." He was not contending, and he thought his hon. friend the Member for Spen Valley would agree with him, that there might not be cases in which a man had invested his savings in public-house property, and probably exceptional provision might be made for such cases in any large scheme dealing with licences. There might be cases of hardship; but it was idle to contend that the brewers of this country had not had ample notice, not merely by the case of "Sharpe *v.* Wakefield," but by other decisions, that their relation to the ownership of public-houses was that of licensees and nothing more.

And, it being Midnight, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again to-morrow.

Adjourned at five minutes after Twelve o'clock.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Tuesday, 7th June, 1904.

MESSAGE FROM THE KING.

THE LATE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY.

The King's Answer to the Address of the 17th of May last reported by the Lord Steward (*E. Pembroke and Montgomery*) as follows:—

"I have received your Address praying that I will give directions that a monument be erected in the Collegiate Church of St. Peter, Westminster, to the memory of the late Most Honourable the Marquess of Salisbury, with an inscription expressive of the high sense entertained by the House of Lords of his rare and splendid gifts, and of his devoted labours in Parliament and in great offices of State. I shall give directions in accordance with your Address."

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Torquay Tramways Bill. A witness ordered to attend the Select Committee.

Acton Improvement Bill. Reported, with Amendments.

Trafford Park Dock and Railway Bill [H.L.], now Trafford Park Bill [H.L.]. Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments.

Canal Rates and Charges (Regents Canal) Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]; Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [H.L.]; Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [H.L.]; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill [H.L.]. Committed. The Committees to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

Harlow and Sawbridgeworth Gas Bill [H.L.]. Commons Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Harrow Road and Paddington Tramways Bill. The LORD CHANCELLOR informed the House that the opposition to the Bill was withdrawn. The orders made on the 13th and 17th of May last discharged, and Bill committed.

Bristol Tramways (Extensions) Bill [H.L.]. The LORD CHANCELLOR informed the House that the opposition to the Bill was withdrawn. The orders made on the 24th of March and 17th of May last discharged, and Bill committed.

Midland Railway Bill. The LORD CHANCELLOR informed the House that the opposition to the Bill was withdrawn. The orders made on the 28th of April and 17th of May last discharged, and Bill committed for Friday next.

Plymouth Corporation Bill. Read 2^a, and committed.

Sheppy Gas Bill. Read 3^a, and passed.

Richard Jaeger's Patent Bill [H.L.]. Read 3^a, and passed, and sent to the Commons.

Colney Hatch Gas Bill; North Staffordshire Railway Bill; Gomersal Gas Bill. Read 3^a, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

Wolverhampton Corporation Bill; Oakengates, Dawley, and District Joint Water Board Bill [H.L.]; Humber Commercial Railway and Dock Bill; Great Central Railway Bill. Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Earl of Dartrey be proposed to the House as a member of the Select Committee on the said Bills in the place of the Earl of Belmore, and that the Earl of Dartrey be Chairman of the said Committee; read, and agreed to.

Commons Regulation (Merrow) Provisional Order Bill; Commons Regulation (Oxshott) Provisional Order Bill; Land Drainage Provisional Order Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (Gas) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 12) Bill; North British Railway (General Powers) Order Confirmation Bill. Brought from the Commons; read 1^a; to be printed; and referred to the Examiners.

Carlisle Corporation Bill; Lytham Improvement Bill; Radcliffe Tramways and Improvement Bill; London United

Tramways Bill; Middlesborough, Stockton-on-Tees, and Thornaby Tramways Bill; Thames River Steamboat Service Bill. Brought from the Commons; read 1^a; and referred to the Examiners.

Paisley District Tramways Order Confirmation Bill (No. 92); North British Railway (General Powers) Order Confirmation Bill (No. 93). Read 1^a; to be printed; and (pursuant to the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, (1899) deemed to have been read 2^a (The Lord Kintore (*E. Kintore*), and reported from the Committee.

Water Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.]; Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.]; Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 3) Bill [H.L.]; Read 2^a (according to order).

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (Birmingham) Bill [H.L.]. Read 3^a (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons.

Govan Burgh (Electricity) Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to.

Elysée Palace Hotel Company, Limited, Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments.

Liverpool and London and Globe Insurance Company Bill [H.L.]; University of Leeds Bill [H.L.]; York Town and Blackwater Gas Bill [H.L.]; Chesterfield Corporation (Tramways and Improvements) Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Croydon Gas Bill; Chippenham Gas Bill. Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to.

PARLIAMENTARY PAPERS (RECESS).

The Lord Chancellor acquainted the House that the following Papers, having been commanded to be presented to this House by His Majesty, had been so presented on the following dates by delivery to the Clerk of the Parliaments, pursuant to Standing Order No. CXI., viz.:—

TRADE REPORTS—I. (ANNUAL SERIES)

No. 3168. Turkey (Basra); No. 3169. China (Newchang) (May 20); No. 3170. Turkey (Smyrna, etc.) (May 26); No. 3171. France (Havre, etc.); No. 3172. France (Budget for 1904); No. 3173. Russia (Rostov-on-Don); No. 3174. China (Chinkiang) (May 28); No. 3175. United States (Boston) (May 31); No. 3176. France (Brest) (June 3).

II. (MISCELLANEOUS SERIES).

No. 610. Industrial Development of Italy; No. 611. Navigation Schools in Germany (June 3).

MINES AND QUARRIES.

I. Report to the Secretary of State for the Home Department, by J. S. Haldane, Esq., M.D., F.R.S., J. S. Martin, Esq., His Majesty's Inspector of Mines, and R. A. Thomas, Esq., on the health of Cornish miners (May 25); II. (General Report and Statistics for 1903: Part I. District Statistics)—Statistics of the persons employed, output, and accidents at mines and quarries in the United Kingdom, arranged according to the Inspection Districts (June 3).

COLONIES (ANNUAL).

No. 415. Falkland Islands (Report for 1903) (May 25); No. 416. Leeward Islands (Report for 1902–1903) (June 3).

FISHERIES (SCOTLAND).

Twenty-second Annual Report of the Fishery Board for Scotland, being for the year 1903: Part II. Salmon Fisheries (May 25).

MILITIA AND VOLUNTEERS (ROYAL COMMISSION).

Report of the Royal Commission on the Militia and Volunteers (May 25).

IRISH LAND COMMISSION (PROCEEDINGS).

Return for the month of January, 1904 (May 25).

MARRIAGES, BIRTHS, AND DEATHS (IRELAND).

Supplement to the Thirty-seventh Report of the Registrar-General, containing decennial summaries for the years 1891–1900 (May 25).

DUBLIN METROPOLITAN POLICE.

Statistical tables for the year 1903 (May 27).

TUBERCULOSIS (HUMAN AND BOVINE) (ROYAL COMMISSION).

Interim Report of the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the relations of human and animal tuberculosis (May 27).

FRANCE (No. 2) (1904).

Notes exchanged between the Marquess of Lansdowne and the French Ambassador on signature of the Convention and Declarations of 8th April, 1904 (May 31).

TRANSVAAL.

Despatch from the Governor of the Transvaal, enclosing a return with regard to the magistrates of the colony (May 31).

ARMY (MEDICAL DEPARTMENT).

Report for the year 1902 (June 1).

BANKING AND RAILWAY STATISTICS (IRELAND).

Report for December, 1903 (June 1).

DISEASES OF ANIMALS ACTS.

Report of Proceedings as regards Ireland for the year 1903 (June 1).

SOUTHERN RHODESIA.

Correspondence relating to the proposed introduction of Indentured Asiatic (Chinese) Labour into Southern Rhodesia (in continuation of [Cd. 1200], July, 1902) (June 1).

COMMERCIAL, No. 5 (1904).

Further findings of the Permanent Commission established under Article VII. of the Sugar Convention of 5th March, 1902, and further reports of the British Delegate (in continuation of "Commercial" No. 6, (1903)) (June 1).

INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION BOARD (IRELAND).

Annual Report, for the year 1903 (June 2).

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND).

Thirty-first Annual Report by the Accountant for Scotland to the Scotch Education Department (June ?).

EXPLOSIVES ACT, 1875.

Twenty-eight Annual Report of His Majesty's Inspectors of Explosives, being their annual Report for the year 1903. (June 3.)

The same were ordered to lie on the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

No. 3161. United States (Philadelphia); No. 3162. China (Kiungchow (Hoihow)); No. 3163. Netherlands (Java); No. 3177. United States (Porto Rico); No. 3178. Portugal (South Portugal); No. 3179. Greece (The Cyclades).

WEST AFRICA.

Statement of the revenue and expenditure and the trade of the Gambia, Sierra Leone, and the Gold Coast, from the year 1895, and of Lagos and Southern and Northern Nigeria from the year 1900.

EXPLOSIVES (EXPLOSION AT THE FACTORY OF MESSRS. CURTIS AND HARVEY, LIMITED, AT CLIFFE, KENT).

Report to the right hon. the Secretary of State for the Home Department, by Major A. Cooper-Key, His Majesty's Inspector of Explosives, on the circumstances attending an explosion of nitro-glycerine in the separating house of the factory of Messrs. Curtis and Harvey, Limited, at Cliffe, Kent, on the 18th February, 1904.

METROPOLITAN GAS COMMITTEE.

Report of the Departmental Committee appointed to inquire and report as to gas testing in the Metropolis.

STRIKES AND LOCK-OUTS (BOARD OF TRADE (LABOUR DEPARTMENT)).

Report on the strikes and lock-outs in the United Kingdom in 1903, and on Conciliation and Arbitration Boards.

SIGHT TESTS.

Report on the sight tests used in the mercantile marine, for the year ended 31st December, 1903 (in continuation of [Cd. 1580]).

MINES AND QUARRIES.

Reports of His Majesty's Inspectors of Mines and Quarries, for the year 1903.

Presented [by Command], and ordered to lie on the Table.

INDIA (PROGRESS AND CONDITION).

Statement exhibiting the moral and material progress and condition of India, during the year 1902–1903. (Thirty-ninth Number).

POST OFFICE (MONEY ORDERS).

Statutory Rules and Orders, 1904. No. 747.

LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL.

Returns relating to the Council—I. Return showing, up to 31st March, 1904:—

The amount of Consolidated Stock.

The application of the money raised by such stock.

The sums carried to the Consolidated Loans Fund.

The application of the Consolidated Loans Fund.

An estimate of the expenditure of the Council for all purposes, for the year ending 31st March, 1905.

II. Return showing, up to 31st March, 1904:—

All moneys raised by the Metropolitan Board of Works and the Council since the passing of the Act for the purposes mentioned in the Act.

Particulars in relation to every parish, district, union, or place in respect whereof a loan has been obtained from the Metropolitan Board of Works or the Council since the passing of the Act.

PUBLIC RECORDS (HOME OFFICE (CENSUS PAPERS)).

Schedule, containing a list and particulars of classes of documents which were returned to the office of His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Home Department, and which are now in the Public Record Office, but are not considered of sufficient public value to justify their preservation therein.

AGRICULTURE AND TECHNICAL INSTRUCTION (IRELAND) ACT, 1899.

Three Minutes by the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction for Ireland sanctioning forms of instruction for the county borough of Cork and the urban district of Athlone.

POLLING DISTRICTS.

Orders made by the county councils of the counties of—West Riding of York, altering certain polling districts in the Hallamshire Parliamentary Division; Warwick, altering certain polling districts in the county; Stafford, altering certain polling districts in the Handsworth Parliamentary Division.

PRISON ACTS, 1865 TO 1898.

Draft of new rules proposed to be made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department for the government of convict prisons.

PRIVATE LEGISLATION PROCEDURE (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1899.

Report by the Chairman of Committees of the House of Lords and the Chairman of Ways and Means in the House of Commons that the provisions of the Loch Leven Water Power Order and the Loch Lever Water Power Order (Extension of Time) Orders are of such a character that they ought to be dealt with by Private Bills and not by Provisional Orders.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

SEAMEN'S AND SOLDIERS' FALSE CHARACTERS BILL [H.L.].

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (The Earl of DONOUGHMORE): My Lords, this Bill has been prepared after consultation between the Board of Admiralty and the Army Council. The object of the first clause is to provide a summary punishment for persons who make fraudulent use of good conduct certificates of discharge granted to seamen, soldiers, and Marines. As the law at present stands it is a misdemeanour at common law to forge a character or to utter a forged character, but these offences are punishable on indictment and not summarily. Whilst providing that offenders may be punished summarily the Bill will not, of course, interfere with the power to proceed by indictment in aggravated cases. A number of cases have arisen which render necessary such a provision as is contained in Clause 1. The object of Clause 2 is to prevent false characters being given by men offering themselves for enlistment. Your Lordships are probably aware that for some time past we have demanded characters from all men who wish to enlist, but we have no way of punishing those who present false characters. This clause makes it an offence to furnish a false character. We had one very flagrant case in February last, of a man presenting a most excellent character from his brother-in-law. We subsequently found that this man had spent nearly the whole of the last seven years in prison and that his brother-in-law had given him this good character in order to get rid of him. Clause 3—the last clause in the Bill—has been inserted because doubts have arisen as to whether Section 16 of the Naval Enlistment Act of 1853 applies to a man entering the Naval Reserve Forces. At the time of the passing of that Act the Naval Reserve Forces did not exist, and it is to remove any doubts and to ensure that the necessary provisions shall apply to these people that this clause has been inserted. I move that the Bill be read a second time.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Earl of Donoughmore.*)

On Question, Bill read 2ª (according to order), and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Thursday next.

STREET BETTING BILL [H.L.].

Read 3ª (according to order); an Amendment made; Bill passed, and sent to the Commons.

House adjourned at twenty minutes before Five o'clock, to Thursday next, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 7th June, 1904.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Alexandra (Newport and South Wales) Docks and Railway Bill [Lords]. To be read a second time upon Tuesday next.

Barrow-in Furness Corporation Bill [Lords]; Bournemouth Corporation (Tramways) Bill [Lords]; Bristol Corporation Bill [Lords]; Filey Improvement Bill [Lords]; Great Western Railway Bill [Lords]; Holywood Tramways Bill [Lords]; North Wales Electric Power Bill [Lords]; Portmadoc, Beddgelert, and South Snowdon Railway Bill [Lords]; Preston Corporation Water Bill [Lords]; St. Mary Woolnoth Bill [Lords]. Read a second time, and committed.

Standing Orders. Ordered, That so much of Standing Order 91 as fixes Five as the quorum of the Select Committee on Standing Orders be read and suspended. Ordered, That for the remainder of the Session Three be the quorum of the Committee. — (*Mr. Halsey.*)

Loch Leven Water Power Bill. "To confer further Powers on the Loch Leven Water and Electric Power Company; and to extend the time for the purchase of lands and for the completion of part of the authorised works of that Company; and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP I).

The CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS informed the House that the Committee on Group I of Private Bills, not being appointed to meet until Wednesday, 8th June, the parties opposing the Local Government Provisional Order Confirmation (No. 4) Bill (Portsmouth Order) had appeared before him and proved that the evidence of Mr. Mosely Somers Gardner, Surgeon General Faught, Mr. Edwin Bradshaw, and Mr. George Ebenezer Stares was essential to their case; and that their attendance could not be procured without the intervention of the House. Ordered, That Mr. Mosely Somers Gardner, Surgeon General Faught, Mr. Edwin Bradshaw, and Mr. George Ebenezer Stares do attend the Committee on Group I of Private Bills To-morrow, at half-past Eleven of the o'clock.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to—

St. Marylebone Electric Lighting Bill, with Amendments.

Amendments to—Cambrian Railways Bill [Lords]; Nuneaton and Chilvers Coton Urban District Council Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

PETITIONS.

ALKALI, ETC., WORKS REGULATION BILL.

Petition from Manchester, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions for alteration; from Leith; Dalgety; and Sorn; to lie upon the Table.

HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES, ETC., BILL.

Petition from Portsmouth, against; to lie upon the Table.

LAND VALUES (ASSESSMENT AND RATING BILL).

Petition from Burton-upon-Trent, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions against; from Burley in Wharfedale; Manaccan; Otley; Stoke Newington; Devonport (two); Southampton (two); Upton Cross; Ilfracombe (two); Barnstaple; Woolfardisworthy; Welcombe: Newton Abbot (two); Mortonhampstead; Kettering (four); Hornsey; Watlington; Caversham; Britwell Salome and Ewelme; Russell's Water; Henley on Thames; Watlington; Chalgrove; Glasgow (six); Notting Hill; Darlington; East Dereham; Forest Hill; Derby (four); Ingatestone (two); Cooksmill Green; Norton Heath; Hatfield; Brentford; Saint Albans; Salford; Leyton; Coatbridge (two); Holbrook; Bayswater; Tamworth; Battersea; Lymm; Northenden; Bowdon (two); Blackburn; Hammersmith; Bedminster; Finchley; Wavertree; Bristol (six); Lanark; Anniesland; Bridlington; Blaydon; Whickham; Carstairs; Mitian; Silverwell; Saint Agnes; Dunston-on-Tyne; Appledore; Bideford; Lancaster; Gloucester; Kidderminster (two); Birmingham (three); Little Milton; Great Milton; Wilmslow; Brighton; Stirling North; Lancaster; Galgate; Warton; Wray; Tewitfield; Arkholme; Holme; Waterloo; Caton; Silverdale; Worksop; Kingsteignton; Newtown; Northfield; Flixton; Davyhulme; Esh Winning; Durham; Mount Hawk; Carnforth; Lozant Callington; Camelford; Aslacton; Harwich; Govan; Selly Oak (two); Edinburgh; Little Hulton; Altrincham; Sale; Knutsford; Saffron Walden; Radford; Oxford; Bellshill; Tayport; Fenny Stratford; Exeter (two); Chudleigh; Lustleigh; St. Martin; Rushden; Stanwick; Rowley Regis; Cumberland; Dumfries; Perranporth; Coverack; Manchester (four); Wheal Frances; Montrose (two); Arbroath (two); Kennington Lane; Bovey Tracey (two); High Blantyre; Walsingham (two); Forfar; Forfar North; Brechin; Spring Hill; St. Keverne; West Dean; Bradford; Greenock; Ecclefechan; Stoke Newington; Nottingham; Coventry (two); Women's Liberal Federation; Folkestone; Mawnan; Hinckley; Thornaby on Tees; Stockton on Tees (two); Bath (two); Bridge; Radstock; Camerton; Wells; Wishaw; Withington; Brixham; Deptford; Woburn Sands; Bletchley; Eltham; East Ham; Wanstead; Tenby; Great Malvern (two); Malvern Link; Small Heath; Bolingey; Fife; Keighley (four); Winterbourne; Chelston; Iron Acton; Highbury; Penzance; Islington; Teddington; Upper Boddington; Surbiton; Hanworth; Hampton; Abingdon; Salford (two); Southport (three); Princetown (seven); Grasslot; Maryport (four); Congleton; Shepley; Portsmouth; Fakenham; London; Gunwen; Greenock; Beeston; Alveston; Wigton; Morecambe; Matterdale; Newbiggin; Dundee; Stainton; Newton Heath; (four); Norwich (four); Polmont; Blowick; Everton; Newchurch; St Just (three); St. Ives;

Prestleigh; Pilton; Middlesbrough (two) Ayr; Torrington; Newtown; Denby Dale (two); Skelmanthorpe; Lower Cumberworth; Congleton; Stevenage; Walkern; Macclesfield (four) Kirkford; Randwick; Standish; Drayton; Ryecroft; Stirling; Kilsyth; Stirlingshire; Penrith; Hampton Hill; Slaithwaite; Brigham and Cockermouth; Thornbury; Ilkeston; Luton; Rye Hill; Bolton (two); Lower Withington; Eastville Park; Hertford; Middlewich; Davenport; Chester (two); Tallywain; Intake; Lancashire and Cheshire; Fulshaw; Morley; Wilmslow (two); Frampton Cotterell; Luddenden Dean; Luddenden; Earthcott Green; Grimsbury; Cosham; Heatherlands; Chipping Warden; Thornaby on Tees; Lambeth; Portobello; Lancaster; Westminster; Calverton; Mold; Wilsden; Kinross; Skeeby; Thornton; Townhill; Taunton; Almondsbury; Pocklington; Chorley; Elvaston; Hulton; Olveston; Stroud; and Fareham; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions for alteration; from Penzance Tottenham (two); Leith; Westbury on Trym; Clacton on Sea; and South Tottenham; to lie upon the Table.

RE-VACCINATION BILL.

Petitions against; from Poplar; and Keighley; to lie upon the Table.

RE-VACCINATION BILL.

Petition from Bermondsey, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

SEA FISHERIES BILL [LORDS].

Petition] from Lowestoft, against; to lie upon the Table.

VALUATION BILL.

Petition from Ely, against; to lie upon the Table,

VALUATION BILL.

Petitions for alteration; from Sunderland; Southwell; and Goole; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS ETC.

COUNTY COURTS (IRELAND) REGISTRARS (SALARIES, ETC.).

Return [presented 31st May] to be printed. [No. 198.]

INDIAN ARMY (MEMORANDUM).

Return presented, relative thereto [Address 3rd June; *Sir Howard Vincent*]; to lie upon the Table.

MINES AND QUARRIES.

Copy presented, of Reports of His Majesty's Inspectors of Mines for the year 1903 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PRISONS (RULES FOR CONVICT PRISONS).

Copy presented, of Draft of New Rules proposed to be made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department for the government of Convict Prisons [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 199.]

METROPOLITAN GAS (DEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE).

Copy presented, of Report of the Departmental Committee appointed to inquire and report as to Gas Testing in the Metropolis [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PUBLIC WORKS (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 3rd June, 1904, authorising the lease of a house and small yard attached, at the landward end of the West Pier, Kingstown [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

SUPERANNUATION ACT, 1887.

Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 2nd June, 1904, granting a retired allowance to Matthew Farrelly, Examining Officer, 2nd Class, Liverpool, Customs [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

EAST INDIA (NATURAL FERTILISERS).

Address for "Copy of Memorandum on the subject of the existence of natural fertilisers in India in proximity to land suitable for growing cotton, prepared by the Department of Agriculture in India."—(*Mr. Emmott.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Holidays of Metropolitan Police Force.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department what is the amount of leave granted to members of the Metropolitan Police Force; whether he is aware that, in accordance with a Memorandum issued by Sir Edward Bradford on the 8th September, 1900, many men lose fortnightly leave owing to its falling due during the time they are on annual leave, and that they are debarred from adding this fortnightly leave to their annual leave; and whether he can arrange, as in the case of postmen, that both leaves may be taken consecutively.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) The annual leave granted to the several ranks of the Metropolitan Police, is as follows:—

Superintendents - - -	42 days
Chief and Local Inspectors -	21 ,,
Sub-Divisional Inspectors -	19 ,,
Inspectors - - - -	17 ,,
Station Sergeants and Divisional Clerks - - -	15 ,,
Sergeants - - - -	13 ,,
Constables - - - -	10 ,,

In addition to annual leave, one day's leave is granted fortnightly to all ranks except that of superintendent. The Commissioner has for some time had under his consideration the question of granting an extra day's leave in lieu of any day of fortnightly leave which happens to fall within the period of annual leave; and I understand that he hopes shortly to be able to make arrangements for this purpose, but it will not be possible to allow the extra day to be taken continuously with the annual leave.

Undersized Fish Bill—Date of Second Reading.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he can now say when it is proposed to take the Second Reading of the Undersized Fish Bill.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) I am afraid I cannot fix a day for the Second Reading of this Bill. I understand, however, that arrangements are on foot which afford some promise that certain objections which have been taken to the Bill may be mitigated.

Water Supply of Erbusaig School, Ross-shire.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask the Secretary for Scotland whether he is aware that the water supply for Erbusaig Public School, Ross-shire, consists of surface water drained into a shallow well unprovided with a suitable protecting cover; that the water is liable to all sorts of animal pollution; and that in dry weather the supply ceases; and, seeing that the water is often quite unfit for drinking purposes, and that an ample supply of spring water may be obtained from the hill face three or four hundred yards from the school, will the Local Government Board for Scotland suggest to the local authorities the expediency of having the water conveyed to the school by pipes from this source.

(*Answered by Mr. A. Graham Murray.*) I am informed that the water supply for Erbusaig School, though ample at present, is conducted into the premises from a shallow surface well and is liable to be affected by drought. A plentiful supply of good water is, however, always obtainable within eighty yards of the school.

Discipline in Scottish Poorhouses—Amalgamation of Scottish Poorhouses.

MR. HALDANE (Haddingtonshire): To ask the Secretary for Scotland, with reference to the Report of the Departmental Committee on Poor Law Medical Relief, whether the Local Government Board have yet considered the question of the discipline and punishment of inmates of Scottish poorhouses; and, if so, to state what steps they intend to take in the matter.

MR. HALDANE: Also to ask the Secretary for Scotland, with reference to the Report of the Departmental Committee on Poor Law Medical Relief, whether the Local Government Board have yet considered if any, and what, poorhouses should be amalgamated with others on the ground that they contain few inmates; and, if so, to state what action they intend to take in regard thereto.

(*Answered by Mr. A. Graham Murray.*) I have to refer the hon. Member to the Answer I gave yesterday to Questions addressed to me by the hon. Member for Berwickshire in regard to this matter.†

---

† See page 800.

Certificates of Deduction of Income-Tax on Coupons of Consol Certificates.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL (Yorkshire, Cleveland): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, in view of the Bank of England now refusing to give certificates of deduction of tax on coupons of Consol certificates cashed in the past, but yet within the statutory limit for obtaining a refund of income-tax, except upon such certificates being asked for by the persons or bankers presenting the coupons for encashment, and in view of the number of persons residing abroad who are not able to fulfil these conditions by reason of their not knowing by what London bankers or agents these coupons were presented for encashment, he will issue instructions to the Inland Revenue Department to obtain, as they have done in the past, certificates of deduction of tax from the Bank of England on the production of an affidavit from the owners of the Consol certificates and the coupons that they belonged to them during the period for which they are making a claim for refund of tax.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) It is hardly likely that cases of hardship such as suggested by the hon. Member could arise. But, if such cases should occur in connection with coupons already cashed, they shall be investigated and considered on their merits.

Sale of the Fitzgerald Estate, County Mayo.

DR. AMBROSE (Mayo, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Fitzgerald Estate, situate at Turlough, Castlebar, county Mayo, is about to be sold; that negotiations are taking place for the sale of the untenanted lands to graziers; and whether, in view of the fact that there are several small farmers in the neighbourhood of those grazing lands, he will see that those lands are purchased with a view to the enlargement of the holdings of those farmers.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) Negotiations are pending, I understand, for the sale of this estate; but, so far, no originating application in respect of sale has been lodged with the Estates Commissioners. Should such an application be made, the Commissioners will have due regard to all the circumstances of the estate before sanctioning advances.

Electric Lighting for the Four Courts, Dublin.

MR. HEMPHILL (Tyrone, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the delay in introducing electric lighting in the Four Courts, Dublin; and, if so, whether he will take steps to expedite the action of the Board of Works in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Victor Cavendish.*) The question of lighting the Four Courts and other public offices in Dublin by electricity is under consideration; but, until negotiations now proceeding with the Dublin Corporation as to the cost of current are concluded, it is not possible to decide whether the expense of the change will be justified.

Prevention of Corruption Bill—Second Reading.

MR. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he will consider the general demand for the passing into law of the Prevention of Corruption Bill, and will take steps to secure the Second Reading at an early date with a view of it being passed this session.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) I should be glad to see this Bill passed, but the state of public business does not enable me at present to make any definite arrangement as to taking the further stages of the measure.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Training Vessels and the Western Highlands.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether arrangements will be made for a training vessel to visit Lochbroom, Ross-shire, and other parts of the Western Highlands this summer.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. PRETYMAN, Suffolk, Woodbridge): The "Cleopatra" has recently visited Lochbroom and is now at Stornoway. It has been arranged that she should visit Gare Loch later in the month.

Punishment of Natives in the Transvaal Mines.

MR. WHITLEY (Halifax): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he has now any information confirming or contradicting the statements of the Native Chiefs Umzimkulu and Umhalla that natives in the Transvaal mines are convicted for trivial offences, and after the expiry of their sentences are sent, against their will for six months' service in the mines.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. LYTTELTON, Warwick and Leamington): I have not yet received a reply to my communication to Lord Milner on the subject, but expect it directly.

MR. WHITLEY: I will repeat the Question next Monday.

Chinese Labour in the Transvaal.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL (Yorkshire, Cleveland): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he will state how many women and children accompanied, or will follow, the thousand Chinese coolies who are now on their way to the Transvaal.

MR. LYTTELTON: I understand that though emigrants were made thoroughly aware of provision made for taking out families and special accommodation on board was ready, none took advantage of the privilege, and that it is impossible to say how many may send for their families later on, which they have been encouraged to do.

India's Contributions to, and Benefits from, the Imperial Institute.

SIR MANCHERJEE BHOWNAGGREE (Bethnal Green, N.E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India if he will state what is the total amount of the funds contributed by the chiefs, princes, and people of India, either as direct donations or through their local Governments, to the Imperial Institute; what is the proportion of that amount which has been spent on the erection of the Institute and on its endowment, respectively; what has been the total cost to Indian revenues of the Indian section of the Institute since its foundation; also the present annual grant made by India for its upkeep, and towards the maintenance of the Research Department; and what are the special benefits that India is deriving from the expenditure under the last-mentioned heading.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): The total sum subscribed by India for the Imperial Institute was £114,528. As the Indian subscriptions were paid into the general fund, aggregating £426,000, from which the Institute was built and endowed, it is not possible to say to what extent they were appropriated for the building or for the endowment. The total of the annual grants from Indian revenues for the maintenance of the Indian section over a period of thirteen years amounted to £20,361 up to 31st March, 1904. The Indian Government expended 10,000 rupees on a collection of raw products, which from time to time it has supplemented and renewed. The present annual grant for the maintenance of the section is £1,525, which includes a sum of £200 as a contribution to the Research Department of the Institute in return for laboratory reports on Indian products. This work is done on behalf, and at the instance, of the Government of India, and is important and valuable.

Protection for Mecca Pilgrims.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is aware that the pilgrims who recently returned to Cairo from the pilgrimage to Mecca complain of the ill-treatment they received at the hands of the Bedouins, especially in the neighbourhood of Mecca: the caravans being attacked and the pilgrims, men, women, and children, maltreated and subjected to various indignities; and, having regard to the fact that the pilgrimage was made under arrangements sanctioned by the Egyptian Government, will he consider the expediency of making representations to that Government with a view to securing protection for the Mecca pilgrimage next year.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Earl PERCY, Kensington, S.): The answer to the first paragraph is in the affirmative. The Egyptian Government are already considering what arrangement can be made for the better protection of the pilgrims next year.

Repatriation of Macedonian Refugees.

MR. WHITLEY: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether any steps are being taken by the Turkish and Bulgarian Governments to repatriate the Macedonians who took refuge in Bulgaria; and, if so, whether any monetary gifts or advances, other than gifts from charitable societies, are being made by those Governments to the returning refugees to enable them to make a new start.

EARL PERCY: Mixed Commissions have been formed by the two Governments at eight points on the frontier line where the refugees are allowed to cross and a note is taken by both the Turkish and Bulgarian officials of their names, their native places, and the goods they bring with them. Moreover, the co-operation of the French Consul at Adrianople and of the British Military Attaché at Constantinople has been accepted to supervise the work of repatriation. The Bulgarian Government allotted £4,000 towards repatriation and have since decided to borrow £40,000 from the Banque Agricole and to distribute it among the refugees in the form of loans repayable, without interest, after five years. 3,000 liras have been advanced by the Turkish Agricultural Bank, assisted by the Imperial Treasury, for seed and other purchases.

The Macedonian Gendarmerie.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he can present copies of General Giorgis' proposals as to the establishment and organisation of the Macedonian *gendarmerie* and a statement showing which of those proposals have been accepted by the Turkish Government.

EARL PERCY: The Papers in question are of a confidential nature, and His Majesty's Government are not at present at liberty to communicate them to the House.

Macedonian Reform—Reports of Assessors.

MR. CHARLES ALLEN (Gloucestershire, Stroud): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the Assessors in Macedonia have as yet made any tours in the country districts of Macedonia; and, if so, whether they were accompanied by Turkish officials; and whether the Government can lay upon the Table any reports received from them.

EARL PERCY: The Austro-Hungarian Assessor has left Salonica for Uscub. The Russian Assessor is ill and will be replaced temporarily by Monsieur de Giers, the Russian Consul-General at Salonica. The elaboration of the scheme of reforms has, we understand, up to the present necessarily made large demands upon their time, and His Majesty's Government have received no representations from the Austro-Hungarian and Russian Governments that the freedom of action of their agents has been hampered by conditions insisted upon by the Turkish Government. No reports from them have as yet been communicated to us.

Administration of Colonial Possessions.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether any decision has yet been reached as to the transfer of the British East Africa and Uganda Protectorates from the Foreign Office to the Colonial Office.

EARL PERCY: It is proposed that the transfer shall take place next year.

MR. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): May I ask whether, under the circumstances, the noble Lord will consider the advisability of refraining from leaving any sort of irritation behind him in the way of land settlements.

EARL PERCY: We should of course be equally anxious to avoid giving any cause for such irritation whether the Protectorates are transferred or not.

Mr. BAYLEY (Derbyshire, Chesterfield): Will Zanzibar and Pemba also be transferred to the Colonial Office?

Earl PERCY: I must ask for notice of that Question.

Mr. HERBERT SAMUEL: Will the transfer take place at the beginning of the financial year?

Earl PERCY: I should think it probable.

Income-tax Abatements.

Mr. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, in view of the fact that an owner or lessor is obliged to pay income-tax on the valuation of house property (if not himself the occupier) even though he derives no net income from same (the head rent, local taxes, and repairs often absorbing the gross income derivable from same), and that in the case of a claim for abatement or exemption no deduction is allowed for the diminution of income owing to money expended for the repairs of house property, he will consider the advisability of amending the law so that the owner may not lose the benefits of the statutory abatement or exemption and be [obliged to pay income-tax on an income he does not receive.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.): The statutory deduction from the assessment upon a house of one-sixth of its full annual value—which is granted by Section 35 of the Finance Act, 1894—is, I think, amply sufficient in ordinary cases to cover all necessary expenditure in connection with the up-keep of the property, and no further allowance seems to be called for. As regards head rent (to which the hon. Member refers as absorbing part of the income derived from such property) the owner of the house is entitled to deduct income-tax from the payment made to the ground landlord, thus throwing upon the latter the burden of the duty, and such head rent would not be regarded as part of the owner's income for the purpose of ascertaining his title to exemption or abatement.

Over-payments of Income-tax.

Mr. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, having regard to the fact that the London and Westminster Bank, Limited, as agents for the Cape Government, deducted 1s. 3d. in the £ from dividends paid 15th April, 1903, and that this is 4d. in the £ in excess of the amount due for income-tax on that date, will he state how much of the £3,300 thus overpaid has since been refunded by the Inland Revenue to stockholders; and will arrangements be made for moneys overpaid to the Inland Revenue as income-tax by agents for Government loans to be refunded to such agents.

The FINANCIAL SECRETARY of the TREASURY (Mr. Victor Cavendish, Derbyshire, W.): The amount refunded in respect of this transaction is not separately recorded and cannot be stated. Arrangements are made for moneys overpaid to the Inland Revenue as income-tax to be refunded in all cases when application is made in the prescribed manner.

Female Learners in Provincial Post Offices.

Sir JOHN LENG (Dundee): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether his attention has been directed to cases in provincial post offices in which young women, who have passed their examinations satisfactorily, have been retained from two to four years as learners, receiving only five shillings a week; and whether he has taken any action to diminish the number of such cases.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Lord Stanley, Lancashire, Westhoughton.): I am aware that in some cases paid female learners have had to wait a considerable time before vacancies occurred to which they could be appointed, and, as I recently explained, wherever it is found that the number of vacancies on the establishment is not so great as was anticipated, steps are taken to diminish the number of learners.

Hospital Accommodation in Ross-shire.

Mr. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland, in view of the statement contained in the last report of the medical officer of health for Ross and Cromarty relative to the need of hospital accommodation for the county, will he state what decision the Local Government Board have arrived at on the subject.

The SECRETARY for SCOTLAND (Mr. A. Graham Murray, Buteshire): The question of hospital accommodation for the district of the county of Ross has received and is still receiving the careful consideration of the Local Government Board. I shall be happy to give the hon. Member more detailed information privately, as it would take too long to give it in answer to a Question.

Water Supply to Ross-shire Schools.

Mr. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland, in view of the statement contained in the last report of the medical officer of health for Ross and Cromarty in regard to the necessity for a suitable supply of pure water for the public schools, will he state how many of the 135 public schools in Ross-shire have a water supply laid on to the premises.

Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: I have not details as to how each school in Ross-shire is supplied with water, but out of the fifty-three schools on the mainland as to which I have information thirteen have water laid on; the remaining forty are supplied from an adjoining well or stream. In Lewis almost every school has the supply laid on.

Tralee and Dingle Railway.

Mr. FIELD: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is able to state in what position the negotiations respecting the Tralee and Dingle Railway are at present; and whether he will submit to the House the proposed agreement previous to its being accepted, and whether it will contain clauses to safeguard the public rights.

The CHIEF SECRETARY for IRELAND (Mr. Wyndham, Dover): The negotiations are still in progress. The terms of any arrangement which may be arrived at between the Government and the Great Southern and Western Railway Company will be communicated to the county council.

*Mr. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green): Are we to understand that this House will have no voice in the settlement of the agreement?

Mr. WYNDHAM was understood to reply in the negative.

Mr. MURPHY (Kerry, E.): Is the arrangement to be submitted to the county council for its approval or is it merely to be indicated to it?

Mr. WYNDHAM: It is one of the parties to the transaction.

The Irish Society's Londonderry Estates.

Mr. O'DOHERTY (Donegal, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that, in the pending sale of the Irish estates of the Honourable the Irish Society, offers of sale have been made to non-agricultural tenants within the county borough of Londonderry, and to the owners of villa residences outside the city, whereas in many cases outside the county borough the society have refused to sell to agricultural tenants their holdings; and whether, considering that the Irish Society are merely trustees for the citizens of Londonderry and surrounding districts, the Estates Commissioners will consult the Londonderry Corporation and the Londonderry County Council, as representing the beneficiaries, before sanctioning the sale of the estate, or any part thereof, or, in the alternative, will he appoint a Committee of this House to see that the objects of the trust created by charter are duly carried out, and that the beneficiaries do not suffer any loss by the pending sale.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The local rumours and apprehensions on which this Question is evidently based are, as in many other cases, totally devoid of foundation. I am informed by the Irish Society that it has offered to sell to every agricultural tenant on these estates. The terms offered and accepted were identical in the case of every agricultural holding, except on some seven holdings in close proximity to the city of Londonderry. No similar offers have been made to non-agricultural tenants within the city boundary. The question whether the agreements made by the Society with their tenants come within the scope of the Act in all such cases will be for the consideration of the Estates Commissioners. The issue of the usual notices by the Commissioners before vesting the estate will afford all parties interested therein an opportunity for making any application they may be advised. I wish, however, to guard myself from admitting that the property of the Irish Society is bound by any trusts for any specific purpose which could be inferred in a Court of law or which prevents the Society from selling to its tenants on terms of which it approves. The reply to the concluding inquiry is in the negative.

Mr. O'DOHERTY: Did not a Select Committee of this House decide that the Irish Society were only trustees?

Mr. WYNDHAM: I am not aware; but that does not preclude their selling the property to tenants under the terms of the Land Act of last session.

Mr. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): Does the Land Act of last session apply to villa residences?

Mr. WYNDHAM: The hon. Member is as familiar with the terms of the Act as I am.

Irish Joint Stock Banks and the Banking Arrangements for the Land Act.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he is aware that a number of the leading Irish Joint Stock Banks have been in communication with the Irish Office since October last on the subject of the banking arrangements in connection with the Land Purchase (Ireland) Act and other matters, and that these banks have recently conveyed to the Irish Office their dissatisfaction with the decision on the question arrived at by that office; and, if so, whether, in view of the importance of the subject, he will give facilities for discussing it in the House.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: We have been anxious to meet as far as possible the wishes of the Irish Joint Stock Banks, and with this object in view we have made it plain that the annuities payable by the purchasers can be paid into any bank for transmission to the Land Commission Account at the Bank of Ireland. If the hon. and learned Member desires to discuss the question in this House a suitable opportunity would be afforded by the Irish Land Commission Vote. But perhaps I may be allowed to suggest that the most convenient course would be for representatives of the banks to meet the Chief Secretary and myself to discuss the matter privately before any such debate takes place, as I believe a preliminary discussion would be more likely to lead to a satisfactory understanding between us.

Overtime at Omagh Post Office.

Mr. JOYCE (Limerick): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if he is aware that the overtime performed in the Omagh Post Office during the past year has been frequently arranged by a sorting clerk and telegraphist and performed by that officer and another member of the staff, and that the amount of extra duty performed by those two officers during that period exceeded that of the remainder of the appointed staff; and, if so, will he give instructions to have the overtime at Omagh equally distributed among the sorting clerks and telegraphists at that office.

Lord STANLEY: During the past year the duty of arranging the overtime at Omagh has occasionally devolved upon the senior sorting clerk and telegraphist, but only in the absence of his superior officers. I am satisfied that the extra duty at Omagh has, on the whole, been distributed in the most suitable manner.

Corners in Cotton—The Zurich Congress.

Mr. FIELD: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he is aware that at the Zurich Cotton Congress, on the Motion of a German representative, the Congress unanimously decided to urge the Cotton Exchanges of New York, New Orleans, Liverpool, and Alexandria to consider the measures to be adopted to prevent persons who have no direct interest in the cotton trade from operating in the market to the detriment of the whole industry, and also to draw the attention of the Governments of Europe to this matter; and whether the Government will co-operate in treating this subject as an international question.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): Yes, Sir. I have seen the newspaper reports to which the hon. Gentleman refers. If those reports are accurate, evidently the conference at Zurich desired to rely on the non-Governmental action of the authorities in the various centres of the cotton industry, and there seems nothing in the resolution at which they arrived which would require Governmental action on the part either of this country or other countries. If any request comes to this Government for joint action, that request will be carefully considered, although there are advantages in action being taken altogether outside the action of Governments. Perhaps I may add, for the information of the hon. Gentleman and the House, that this question is being very carefully considered by the Commission on Food Supplies.

MR. MARKHAM (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield): Will the right hon. Gentleman consider the question of making it a criminal offence to attempt to corner necessaries of life.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Well, that is one of the extreme propositions which, I have no doubt, are being considered by the commission.

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Mr. HALSEY reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had added to the Standing Committee on Trade (including Agriculture and Fishing), Shipping, and Manufactures, the following fifteen Members in respect of the Shop Hours Bill: Mr. William Abraham (Rhondda), Sir Frederick Banbury, Mr. Cameron Corbett, Sir Charles Dilke, Sir Walter Foster, Mr. Ernest Gray, Mr. Bonar Law, Mr. William Lawrence, Dr. Macnamara, Captain Norton, Sir Francis Sharp Powell, Mr. Herbert Robertson, Mr. Thornton, Mr. Herbert Samuel, and Mr. Whitley.

Report to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 1:—

Amendment again proposed—

"In page 1, line 5, to insert, at the beginning, the words 'During the period of seven years after the passing of this Act.'"—(*Mr. Ellis Griffith.*)

Question again proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Amendment again proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"To leave out the word 'seven,' and insert the word 'fourteen.'"—(*Colonel Williams.*)

Question again proposed, "That the word 'seven' stand part of the proposed Amendment."

MR. ATHERLEY-JONES (Durham, N.W.) said that the Colonial Secretary the previous night stated that the Amendment would involve a proposal of confiscation, but he (Mr. Atherley-Jones) declared that it was this Bill and this Bill only which would possibly involve confiscation, because by it they were endeavouring to establish a vested interest by brewers and publicans in their property. At the present time it was idle to talk of confiscation There was really no confiscation involved in dealing with licences under the existing law. It was otherwise under the Bill, and what they were attempting to do was to modify the effects of this Bill. If this Bill were passed, they were obliged to recognise that the principle of compensation had been assented to by the House, and therefore they were endeavouring to give the brewers and publicans time to consider their position and provide for it, and to insure at the end of that time having that free hand which they believed they at present enjoyed. He disputed that there was any analogy between the compensation proposed by this Bill and that proposed by the Workmen's Compensation Act. The present position was as nearly as possible analogous to that under the Workmen's Compensation Act. Many of them were not opposed to the principle of compensation, they were not opposed to the principle of compensation by the brewers and publicans in their interest, but what they said was that it was not right to crystallise for ever a number of public-houses. There had grown up a kind of idea among publicans that they had something like a moral right, but 80 per cent of the public-houses were owned by brewers, and it was ridiculous to suppose that they had been under a misapprehension. The clearest proof that they had not was that three of their number were at the present time directors of the Licensed Victuallers Insurance Company. It was absurd to say that there was anything approaching a vested interest in these public-houses, and he believed, if they gave the publican fourteen years notice, they would afford him no excuse not to insure. He repudiated the idea of hardship in the case of a publican who lost his licence just after the period of the time limit. The man paid just the same as a person who insured his life for the years during which his premiums were paid and not for any prospective period. The man who insured his life for seven years and then omitted to renew his insurance might as well complain that he had not the misfortune to die during the period he paid. These arguments were fantastic. It might be that a few of the owners of the 1869 beerhouses would suffer and not be able to insure and he was not attached to any hard and fast rule. He thought special provision might be made for them. They desired not to act harshly or ungenerously, but they believed this was a great social evil and that the Bill would not promote temperance, though it might affect some slight improvement in certain localities. They wanted temperance carried on upon lines which could only be secured by permanently establishing full recognition of the principle that licences were licences, and not vested interests.

SIR GEORGE BARTLEY (Islington, N.) said that in considering this question it seemed to him that the Committee, or rather some Members of it, were under a misapprehension as to the subject of the time limit. He was, perhaps, rather sceptical whether the reduction in the number of public-houses would have very much effect in reducing intemperance. He had studied the statistics in connection with that matter a great deal, and he could not reconcile the fact that reducing the number of public-houses would as a natural sequence reduce intemperance. Taking the case of London, of which he knew, perhaps, more than of any other town, he admitted there were too many licensed premises, and, of course, he would like to see a reduction in the number, especially of the smaller houses and of those established under the Act of 1869. The time limit was an attractive sort of thing, but it seemed to him that it was a mistake, and he could not think that the object of the Bill would be promoted by incorporating it in the measure. If he was interested in the liquor trade, which he was not, he did not know that he should mind whether there was a time limit or not, because, whatever period might be introduced, they would still be on the horns of a dilemma. No man would put money into a business if it were liable to be ruthlessly interfered with in the way some hon. Gentlemen appeared to think this trade should be. It seemed to him, therefore, that the introduction of the time limit would really retard the object which hon. Gentlemen opposite professed to have in view. Of course, they approached this matter with different ideas. Some thought that the insertion of a time limit implied that at the end of the period, whatever it might be, seven, fourteen, or twenty-one years, they would have the houses put in a position that they could be shut up forthwith if the magistrates thought fit. But, in his opinion, at the end of the period they would remain in practically the same position as they were at present. Of course, he knew they were not all agreed upon that point, but he, for one, could not believe that the houses would necessarily be shut up at the end of a time limit. A public-house, after all, was a reasonable and proper institution if properly conducted. The only way of approaching this subject fairly and properly was to seek to do away with the houses which were redundant, and he thought, looking at the Amendment, that without a time limit they would be able to effect a great deal more in that direction than if they had a time limit. Reference had been made in the course of the debate to the fact that about 25 per cent. of the houses in London would be done away with under the Bill. It seemed to him that if they could get rid of 25 per cent. of the worst public-houses in London, even if the Bill did nothing else, it would be a very good result indeed to have achieved, and he could not understand hon. Gentlemen opposite objecting to the passing of a measure which would have such an effect. They professed to desire to promote temperance, and yet they were objecting to a Bill which would, they admitted, have the effect of closing 25 per cent. of the public-houses in the Metropolis.

Mr. LOUGH (Islington, W.): There is no security that that will be done.

Sir GEORGE BARTLEY thought there was absolute security that it would be accomplished if the general public desired it, and that it would be done even without the time limit, and he repeated that that would be a great result to have accomplished. He claimed that those who were really interested in the promotion of temperance should support this Bill. After all, it did not settle the thing for ever. It would take a good many years to close all these public-houses, but hon. Members must not think it was possible to bring about such a state of affairs at once. Let them remember that the public-house met a great public want and that the working-man had as much right to use the public-house as anyone else.

Then it seemed to him that the arguments which had been used in regard to compensation were very strange. After all, the money which was to provide the compensation was to be obtained from the publican himself. Some hon. Gentlemen said that it was not the publican's own money, and that the nation had a right to claim it—that it was, in reality, public property. But that argument did not seem to him to be a good argument. In his view the money was as much the money of the brewer and of the publican as anything could be, and whether the system of compensation was to be limited to a number of years or not, it still remained the fact that the money came absolutely out of the pockets of the brewers and the publicans. If this Bill succeeded in simply closing 25 per cent. of the public-houses in London it would, as he had said, be a very good thing indeed; but, in his opinion, it would do much more, because it would deal with those houses which were licensed before 1869, and it would bring them within the new category of houses which there was power to close. If the measure enabled them to deal with a large portion of those houses, that fact alone justified the House in treating it as a great step in advance. He did not wish to discuss this matter at any length. He was very keenly interested in temperance. He believed they were all agreed that one of the greatest curses of this country was the excessive drinking which went on; and he believed also that they were unanimous in desiring to do away with that. There were many ways of securing that end, and he was glad to think that it was gradually being accomplished, that there was less heavy drinking, especially among those of the working classes who had better homes. That, indeed, was the key to the whole situation, for it was in that direction that the signs of improvement were most marked. Still, the fact remained that far too large a sum was spent in alcohol. It was not, however, by abusing the publican and by declaring that he was the man who did the mischief that they were going to alter the present state of affairs. It was of no use punishing him. No doubt many of the smaller public-houses constituted a great temptation to people to drink to excess, and, inasmuch as this measure would enable a large number of these smaller houses to be closed, he could not understand why hon. Gentlemen opposite should oppose it, especially as the compensation to be paid in respect of the licences was to come out of the pockets of the publicans themselves. As he understood it the publicans did not object to the Bill, they rather accepted it.

Dr. HUTCHINSON (Sussex, Rye): Upon what authority does the hon. Gentleman say that the publicans accept this Bill?

Sir GEORGE BARTLEY said he had not noted any indication that they were objecting to it. He thought, perhaps, that if they had been more worldly wise they would have objected to it, and then, perhaps, some hon. Gentlemen opposite who called themselves temperance advocates would have voted the other way. From all he had heard, however, the trade was prepared to accept this arrangement. At any rate, inasmuch as he was convinced that it would tend to reduce the temptation to drink, although he feared it would not make the nation as sober as he would like it to be, he did look upon it as a step in the right direction and should support it. At the same time it did away with a great injustice and hardship, seeing that it made it impossible for magistrates to take away licences from men who were carrying on their business properly without any compensation whatever. As the publicans had agreed to make their own contributions to the compensation fund he looked upon this Bill more as a measure for securing compulsory insurances. It was a system under which everybody would have to pay *pro rata* according to the value of his house, and he certainly contended that that was a system based on reasonable grounds, and as a temperance reformer he was, therefore, prepared to support the measure. If they could get rid of Party feeling for two or three days, he believed nearly every Member would support the measure.

Sir ROBERT REID (Dumfries Burghs) said he hoped he might be excused, although he was a Scotch Member, for taking part in the debate, because he felt that if the principle of the Bill were once applied to England, it was sure very soon to leap across the border. He could say with perfect sincerity that he took no Party view at all of this matter. He believed that the Bill was a pernicious and most dangerous measure, and it was for that reason alone he opposed it. If it were a good Bill, if he believed it would have the good results predicted by some of its supporters, he, regardless of Party ties, would have given his adhesion to it. It was most unfortunate that the present Motion had been brought forward in the way it had, because it had tended to prevent an absolutely clear issue on an important question being presented to the Committee. It was, however, no use finessing in reference to a question of that kind, and he hoped that hon. Gentlemen opposite would not allow any small technicality to prevent them joining in the protest which it was desirable to make at this stage. The time limit was a matter which could not be discussed unless they touched upon the principles of the Bill itself, because the time limit was woven into the texture work of the Bill in every way. He was glad to think that if this subject was involved in a fog it was not, at any rate, a legal fog. One point was perfectly apparent in regard to the whole question, and that was that the lawyers had been much more definite than anybody else upon the matter, and the Courts of Justice which had had to consider the arguments and the different statutes had been perfectly unequivocal as to the legal position of the licence-holders. Putting aside the 1869 licences, which stood in a different position, licences were not only in name but in reality annual licences, and although the Lord Chancellor spoke of the duty of exercising judicial discretion he explained afterwards that he used the phrase only in the sense that he desired to distinguish between judicious and capricious discretion. The real source of difficulty in this matter arose from the manner in which the licence had been valued in the past. No one asserted that the licence duty in the least degree corresponded with the annual value of the premises and the immense benefit conferred upon the licence-holder. It was just the same as a lease on a peppercorn rent. Holders of these leases obtained an enormous property for which they paid an insignificant rent, and they were practically in the same position as the licence-holder. The State had taken no consideration whatever for it, and the consequence was that the mere granting of a licence apart from the remuneration returned for the same created an immense property. There was no objection to calling it property in the least. It was an immense property of precarious duration, but the weakness of the magistrates in past times had been displayed by granting too many of these licences and that had brought about the present state of affairs. There were undoubtedly too many licences in existence.

The question whether it was true that drunkenness corresponded with the multiplicity of licences in a district was one well worth consideration, and in regard to that the Majority and Minority Reports of the Royal Commission were well worth considering. They had unanimously come to the conclusion that it was extremely necessary in the interests of the community to diminish the number of public-houses in order to arrest the gigantic evil which existed by reason of the prevalence of drunkenness in this country. The question was how to secure that end. For his part—and here he was speaking merely his own opinion, he was not professing to represent the views of others—he believed that when once the State put a hand to this business it led them into enormous difficulties. He believed that the right course and the best course was to leave this matter to be dealt with on the priniciple of mutual insurance, or on the principle of ordinary insurance, for it was well known that underwriters and insurance companies in the present day would undertake all kinds of risks. Indeed, it was quite curious to see what strange risks they did undertake, and even the risk of a judgment being reversed in the House of Lords had recently been insured against at Lloyd's. He had, in his own mind, no doubt that if this question were settled in a sense adverse to the contentions of the Government there would arise in the natural course of commerce a complete system by which on payment of a very moderate premium indeed all these risks would be insured against. The same point was discussed at the time when they had before them the Bill known as the Workmen's Compensation Bill, and he remembered how the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham was told that insurance was impossible. He replied at once that it was nothing of the kind, and that he was quite confident that for a small premium the risks could be covered. Events had proved the accuracy of his judgment, and these risks had since been covered by payment of a small premium. If the State were to interfere at all, he would very much prefer that it should do so by itself undertaking the insurance, because then there would not be the risk of dealing with the individual holders of licences. But he did not desire that the State should interfere. At any rate the premium would come out of the pocket of the licence-holder who would have exactly what was offered to him by the Bill with the certainty that either the licence would be renewed or, in the case of non-renewal, he would get the compensation for which he paid the premium. He would rather see the State itself undertake the insurance against this risk than have a scheme like the one before the Committee adopted.

By this Bill a question of compensation which had been suggested as a compromise had been elevated into a principle. If Lord Peel's Report were put into the clausesof an Act of Parliament to-morrow he would feel not only pleased but grateful. Its purpose was not to bestow compensation; not to deprive magistrates of their real control, but to suspend it for a period of years. There was no doubt that Lord Peel's Report, if carried into effect in its entirety, would be a great advantage, but he had always had one feeling in regard to it. It was a most delicate and ingenious mechanism, and it was so delicate that it was hardly made for rough weather. Once they took a single part of that Report away they would find that the whole edifice would break down. The danger always in compromises of that kind was that your adversary could take the principle and strip it of its safeguard, and then you found yourself naked in the face of your enemies. The writings of his hon. friend the Member for Spen Valley had been appealed to, he had used the word compensation and people now appealed to that doctrine. Some hon. Members said they were moderate men, but then they all professed to be moderate men. He did not think many hon. Members were likely to lend themselves to fanaticism on this question. Hon. Members opposite had taken up the principle of compensation and struck out the safeguards, and now they came forward with it as a supposed concurrence in favour of compensation, while nearly all of them meant different things. Last year the Prime Minister was interviewed by a deputation upstairs and they complained of the injustice done to licensed victuallers. The right hon. Gentleman expressed his sympathy with them and agreed that there was an injustice, and so he brought in this Bill. Those hon. Members who now supported the Prime Minister took credit for the fact that they were making the licensed victuallers themselves pay a sum of money to compensate one another. Therefore, the argument was that an injustice to a number of people was remedied by taking money out of their own pockets. It simply meant that if fifty people were suffering an injustice they were to take money out of all their pockets and bestow it upon one of them, and then the argument was that that injustice had been remedied. He thought it was a very strange remedy to make them compensate one another, because they could do that without an Act of Parliament.

Last night the Colonial Secretary presented a very fascinating picture of this Bill, and said it would do a great deal of good and that everyone would be treated according to the principles of eternal justice. The right hon. Gentleman told them that the effect of this Bill would be to enable justices to reduce the number of licences and to diffuse the loss by a principle of mutual nsurance and compulsory premium. Every word of that was true, and that was really the effect of the Bill. This measure did enable the justices to reduce licences without violence to the most tender conscience, and it also diffused the loss by distributing the money and by means of compulsory premium. Those were the effects, but was that all? That was where the Colonial Secretary's statement seemed to him to fall entirely short of the actuality. Those effects were mixed up with other effects of a totally different complexion. He would take a concrete case. Take a place where there were 1,000 licensed houses where there ought to be only 750. In such a case what did this Bill say to the justices? It said—"Look at your schedule and count up the number of licences, and when you have made a calculation according to the provisions of this Act you may reduce to that extent and you may do it year by year. You may if you like reduce it by means of capitalising, but you will tie your hands if you do that for the next thirty or forty years." The Bill must necessarily restrict the power of the justices from doing what they did at the present moment. If there was a frightful state of things which could be remedied by a diminution of licences under the power which the justices had at the present moment, and if it was laid down that the justices could only diminish those licences according to the scale and schedule of this Bill, was it not transparent that they were restricting the power of the justices? But as soon as the outraged sense of a community led the magistrates to take this step, down came the Government with a Bill to restrict their power, and that was the very thing which he complained of. In addition to that, this Bill bestowed fixity of tenure upon the licensee. In the case he had mentioned of 1,000 licences which ought to be reduced to 750, suppose the justices could reduce them by 150 by means of this Bill. All the remainder of those 1,000 licences would have fixity of tenure, whereas before they were liable in the eye of the law to be discontinued. At any rate, their position was so shifted by this Bill that they were not liable to be discontinued, or if they were discontinued they would receive a full equivalent in cash. That must necessarily increase the value of those houses which had fixity of tenure. His hon. friend the Member for Spen Valley expressed the opinion that £125,000,000 sterling would be the value of the public-houses which would come under the operation of this Bill. Mr. Arthur Chamberlain, for whom he had a profound admiration, placed the amount at £300,000,000. He was inclined to think that Mr. Arthur Chamberlain had not over-stated the value of those licences. He wished to give one illustration from the Majority Report. On page 55 the Royal Commission stated what was the value of the public-houses in the county of London and they also gave the actual value of the premises less their value without a licence, and they put that in the county of London at £30,000,000. That might be right or wrong, but it was what the Majority Report stated, and if £30,000,000 represented the capital value within the county of London, he should be very much surprised if £125,000,000 would cover it throughout England and Wales.

*Mr. WHITTAKER (Yorkshire, W.R., Spen Valley) said the authority for the figures in the Report stated that the value of the licences for the whole country would be £150,000,000.

Sir ROBERT REID said at any rate it was a very large sum of money. What the Colonial Secretary had omitted to state in his speech was that in addition to the features he had described there were two other features. In the first place, by this Bill they cut down the power which magistrates had exercised ever since there had been a licence in England; and in the second place, they imparted to property which was said to be worth £125,000,000 at all events a fixity of tenure which must enormously increase its value. Where was that increased value going to come from, and who was going to find the balance? The effect of what was now being done was to make it impossible to apply new methods in the future. Experiments were going on now upon this question in many parts of the world in order to ascertain the best method of treating this fearful evil. It was being dealt with by all the States of the Union, by Australia, Canada, and Scandinavia, and all these places were excellently dealt with in the memorandum issued by his hon. friend. Who was prepared to say now what would be found to be the best method to deal with this question during the course of the next ten, fifteen, or twenty-five years? It was a subject upon which all the experiments were comparatively new and of which the results were being compiled only by degrees. He thought he might safely make one prediction, and it was that whatever system was found to be best, the one that would be most generally condemned would be the system which they had at the present time in this country. It was perfectly certain that a system under which this dangerous traffic was farmed out upon monopoly principles to individuals for private profit must cease. Numerous books had been written on this subject, and no one could read them without coming to the conclusion that the system in this country must come to an end and could not possibly be continued indefinitely. Would the Bill perpetuate that system? That was the crucial question which they had to ask. Would this Bill perpetuate a system which had been condemned by all those authorities who had dealt with this subject? The Colonial Secretary said it would not. Perhaps in law it would not. This Parliament would be able to pass a law for any purpose, and it could repeal this Act in case it became law. But look what practical difficulties would be created by this Bill. If this Bill were passed there would be a legal fixity of tenure recognised in the eyes of the law in every public-house in the country, and they could not try the experiment of local option without buying out every single one of the public-houses in the local option district at an inflated price enhanced by the fixity of tenure created by this Bill. This Bill would make local option practically an almost superhuman work to accomplish with the feelings there were in this country upon it. The large sums of money which would have to be paid on the adoption of local option would be double the price at which those licences stood now, and they would be greatly enhanced in value by fixity of tenure. This Bill was for all time, if anything in human affairs could be for all time. This fixity of tenure would be as fixed and certain and protracted a tenure as any of them might have in land.

Suppose they tried the system of high licensing, that would mean merely that when they were giving an enormously valuable monopoly they did not wish to give it wholly to the individual, but they wanted a part of it for the State. The Prime Minister had spoken of monopoly in terms of regret, and he said it had been a great mistake and that it was a great pity that the system of monopoly had been introduced. He agreed that it was a great misfortune, but suppose they were to try by high licensing to interfere. If they were to endeavour to remedy this evil by a system of high licensing, what would be said? They would be told, "You have not the courage to confiscate our property openly, and so you are indirectly destroying it by this system of high licensing." That was the same way in which property in Ireland was eaten up by unfair rents. Fair rents, free sale, fixity of tenure, were things which all arose round every monopoly. He would tell the Committee where the value of a time limit came in. He thought the Majority Report ought to be quoted in support of a time limit. On page 54 of that Report it was stated that—

> "It has been suggested that there are advantages in settling specified periods at which Parliament should review the working of the system, so as to facilitate the introduction of such changes as the circumstances of the time render necessary. We concur generally with this view, and recommend that recurring periods of seven years would afford a favourable opportunity to make what fresh departures may seem necessary. In the absence of Parliamentary action, the system would continue for

another septennial period, when Parliament could again review the situation. We recommend, therefore, that the system should be worked by septennial periods, and a capital sum borrowed at the commencement of each period on the seven years charges. The advantages of this plan over one giving, say, a seven years time limit to be followed by a very large reduction all at once, are obvious."

Then the advantages were given. He read that extract to show that it was desirable to have pauses. He did not quote it in support of this particular Amendment or of the scheme he had been advocating, but simply to show the value of a time limit or a pause at which they could reconsider the position and determine whether they should continue the system any further.

MR. LLOYD WHARTON (Yorkshire, W.R., Ripon): Our object was to secure that there should be a stocktaking.

SIR ROBERT REID said he did not wish to deal with this question controversially, but to show that what he recommended went beyond what the hon. Member had been recommending as stocktaking. What he wanted was that some fresh opportunity in seven years—or it might be fourteen years—he deprecated the term being fourteen years—should be given for Parliament taking a new departure if in the light of the working of this novel proposal it should be found desirable to make some new proposal. Why were they so afraid that Parliament would do injustice in future? He begged hon. Gentlemen on both sides of the House to remember that, whatever they might think of this proposal, they were entering on an unknown system. It differed from any system that had been tried anywhere else. It would have the most serious effect of depriving the magistrates of their wonted power, it would increase enormously the value of public-houses, and bestow fixity of tenure. Following the advice given by the majority of the Commission let Parliament have an opportunity of considering this in the light of what was going to happen. Do not shut the door for all time. He thought they might fairly expect that as their predecessors had always had confidence in the justice of Parliament in dealing with important public questions so they might be sure that those who followed them would deal justly hereafter if only they reserved for them the opportunity. Pass this Bill and he thought it would be fatal to temperance reform. There were many who thought the same of the measure as he did. There were many hon. Members on the other side who he knew had misgivings on the question.

There was another reason against the bringing forward of this measure. He did not wish to state it angrily, but he felt strongly on the matter. When this Parliament was returned it was on the understanding that it was on the one question which was alone before the electors. [Cries of "No!"] Well, that was his belief. He thought he could quote the language of the Prime Minister in his appeal to the country.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (MR. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): The hon. and learned Gentleman may quote my address as often as he likes, but if he suggests that I or any other Minister suggested that only one subject was to be dealt with by this Parliament it is really absurd. There were other addresses besides mine. Let him read the address of the Leader of the Opposition.

SIR ROBERT REID stated that he did not say the Prime Minister or anybody else said there was an understanding that nothing else was to be dealt with by this Parliament. What he said was that there was only one question at the election, and if he had been allowed to finish, what he had to say was that the result of that was that many persons gave the Government their support on that one question in the belief that there would be no really substantial and important questions contrary to their opinions dealt with in the course of this Parliament. He said for himself, at all events, that it was unfair to pass a Bill of the kind now before Parliament in the present circumstances. It was a perfectly new departure, and they ought to have an opportunity of taking the sense of the people in the constituencies themselves before so dangerous and far-reaching a Bill was allowed to be placed on the Statute-book.

THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL (Sir EDWARD CARSON, Dublin University) said he would not follow his hon. and learned friend who had just spoken into the constitutional disquisition he gave of the powers of the present Parliament. This Parliament had been elected for the ordinary time, and it was almost impossible to conceive that a Parliament elected for a period of six or seven years should only be allowed to deal with the one issue which the hon. and learned Gentleman said was before the country. The question of the time limit had seemed to him all through the debate to be entirely dependent on how hon. Members made up their minds upon this one question as to whether the provision in the Bill giving the trade—to use a term which included the publican and the brewer—the right to insure at their own cost, was a just and expedient measure. The more they examined the question the more they found that it came back to that; and the whole reasoning of his hon. and learned friend was based upon this, that Parliament had no right to give the trade that privilege—if it were a privilege—and they had no case to demand it. If that were so the Opposition were right that there should be a time limit. He entirely disagreed that under the present condition of things, which the hon. and learned Member seemed to ignore, the owners of licences had no claims upon Parliament for the particular privileges which re given to them by the Bill. It was quite true, as the hon. and learned Member had said, that as regarded some of these licences in the eye of the law they were only annual licences, but did he really think that that fact disposed of the present situation as regards the licences? In the eye of the law that might be true, but at the same time the law recognised licences as a taxable entity and a rateable entity and had allowed them to grow up in the course of our commerce as matters which could be sold just like any other property. When the hon. and learned Member stated how the Lord Chancellor and other Judges decided in the case of "Sharpe *v.* Wakefield," did he venture to lay down that the question was disposed of by saying that licences were held upon an annual tenure? He thought the matter was very clearly put by Lord Lindley, who said—

> "It is true that no owner or tenant of a public-house has a right to have his licence renewed; but the expectation that it will be renewed unless there is some good reason why it should not, is founded upon human nature, and is perfectly reasonable and cannot be ignored by any fair-dealing man. Outlays are made on the faith of it, and the expectation gives a market value to the house which can be very closely estimated by persons accustomed to value such property."

So closely could it be estimated that our own law enacted that upon the death of the owners of these houses it should be estimated not upon any consideration of annual value, but upon a value of from twenty up to thirty years. The hon. and learned Member knew perfectly well that when a licensed house was taken for public purposes not only was the value of the licence to the existing holder considered, but in one case the Courts decided that with regard to a reversion expected upon a twenty-six years lease, the outstanding portion would have to be compensated for. What was the use in face of that state of things to try to close the matter by simply saying that a licence was only held for a year in the eye of the law? That was the reason—and this the hon. and learned Member entirely ignored—why the present system as regarded the reduction of licences had absolutely broken down, because it was impossible to have these two systems of law running side by side and expect magistrates who were asked to deprive men of their property to take one view of the law and to ignore the other. The first decision that the House had to come to was whether it was just or not that for the purpose of reducing licences for the public benefit they should allow this system of insurance to be set up at the cost of the trade itself. Was that expedient? It was expedient because without it the present system had failed. If it were both just and expedient, and they had to start upon that basis for the consideration of the time limit, what had the time limit got to do with it? Were they, when they admitted the system of insurance to be just, to say to a man that, although it was just, and, in the public interest, expedient, they were going to ask him at some future time for no consideration to forego this just principle?

He said that that was impossible. It would really come to this—they would say to the owner of these licences, "We allow you to set up an insurance at your own expense, but at the end of seven years, you must be in a worse position than you are at the present moment." That was what it came to.

MR. ASQUITH (Fifeshire, E.): How?

SIR EDWARD CARSON: The right hon. Gentleman asked how. It was for this reason, because at the end of seven years the property vanished altogether.

MR. ASQUITH: How does it?

SIR EDWARD CARSON said he thought that that was the meaning of the Amendment. If it was not, he would take the other alternative—viz., that the publican would be exactly where he was now. Well, were they going to have all this agitation about the country at the end of the next seven years and would the position be any better? As the hon. and learned Member for Blackpool had pointed out they had a case to present to the magistrates now, what, *a fortiori*, would be the case at the end of seven years? The publican would say, "We have actually contributed hundreds and thousands, if not millions, to the extinction of other public-houses for the benefit of the public, and when I ask you for a renewal are you going to say that I am to be extinguished without any compensation at all?" He did not agree with his right hon. friend that that was the meaning of the majority of those who put forward this Amendment. He was perfectly sure a great number of hon. Members meant that at the end of the time limit there was to be what had been called a clean slate. He did not see any other logical way of making any advance at all. If that question was to be put to every candidate at every election when the seven years were up, as to whether he was going to vote for the renewal or non-renewal of the Compensation Bill, did they make any progress at all on this question? No. The licence-holder, if there was to be this extinction at the end of seven years, would be in a worse position than he was now. Now he had a chance, and he had shown that the chance was a very valuable one. The right hon. Baronet the Member for Berwick had said that his objection to the Bill was that it made any change in the present system impossible, and that it meant good-bye to all temperance reform of any kind. Was there ever a more exaggerated—he might almost say ridiculous—statement, that because they admitted the justice of the claim, under existing circumstances, to have this insurance fund set up, this House was never to proceed with any further temperance reform. The hon. Baronet went on to suggest that this Bill, so far from being framed in that way, should be framed with the view to experiments in local option, public-house trusts, or municipalisation of the liquor traffic. Was the right hon. Baronet in favour of local option?

SIR EDWARD GREY (Northumberland, Berwick): I stated as a general principle that you would make no real progress in temperance reform until you enabled progressive local communities to make experiments, and I specified instances of three ways in which experiments might be made. I did not advocate any of them at the expense of the other. My general principle was that this Bill, by establishing by law the existing system, would be an almost insuperable barrier in the way of temperance reform.

SIR EDWARD CARSON said so far as he was concerned he was not in favour of local option, and was not in favour of municipalisation of the liquor traffic, and he did not see why the House should spend its time in the framing of legislation with a view of at any time giving facilities for the setting up either of local option or municipalisation. But he would make this concession to the right hon. Baronet, and to his hon. and learned friend, that if their view was that local bodies should be left free to try these experiments, while ignoring the just claims of the owners of licences, and if the Bill prevented that, then all he could say was that he was very glad the Bill did so. He thought that met the whole case put forward. While it did not in the least prevent the setting up of local option or municipalisation of the liquor traffic, it might hamper, and he hoped it would hamper, any setting of that up unless they were prepared to do justice to those who had interests which the law allowed them to have. While the right hon. Baronet was very clear about the privileges of Parliament, he gave the Committee a curious instance of the power of Parliament. He told them almost in the same breath that if once they set up the insurance system they would never get rid of those licensed houses at all, and at the same time he told them that the freehold of off-licences which existed before 1902 was got rid of by Parliament without paying a penny of compensation at all. Why? The opinion of the country was ripe, and when the Bill was going through the House there was no difficulty whatever in bringing these off-licences under the ordinary jurisdiction, the same as the various other licences. The truth of the matter was, that if opinion in this country ever became such that they wished to confiscate property, he supposed they would do it. If the opinion of this country was ever ripe for local option, and at the same time for granting fair compensation to those whom the law had allowed to acquire property, he was perfectly sure that public opinion would be carried out in that direction. But he submitted that it was absolutely ridiculous to say that, because they had allowed a system of insurance for the purpose of protecting interests which the law had recognised, Parliament was to be impeded in the future from proceeding further in the reform of the liquor laws.

This Bill was a modest Bill. It was an effective Bill in the direction in which it was brought in. What it meant to do was to get rid of the difficulty of inducing the magistrates to reduce those houses by placing in their hands a fund contributed by the trade which would enable them without any difficulty to get rid of a large number of houses. Why should they hamper themselves in relation to that by putting provisions in this Bill dealing with a situation in fourteen or twenty-one years time? It might be that an entirely different situation would then arise. In fourteen years a very large number of the surplus public-houses would have been got rid of. In twenty years a still larger number would have been got rid of. It might be, but he did not at all admit that it would, that the other remaining public-houses might be then better able to contribute larger sums for further reforms. But at all events they were not now in a position to survey what would be the existing state of affairs when the reduction under this Bill had taken place. He could not see why they should hamper themselves or hamper future Parliaments by setting up a system at the end of a number of years when they did not know what the existing circumstances of that time would be. Let the Bill not be mutilated, because that was what the Amendment was meant to do. The measure had in it at least three useful provisions, which must be admitted by any impartial critic as in the interest of temperance. It brought a third of the licences of the country from a state of being freehold and therefore not amenable to the jurisdiction of the magistrates to the condition of the remaining licences. His hon. friends who had already addressed the House always said that they would leave that out of the question for the moment, and that they would come back to it, but they never did. But, after all, they must admit that they were not under the magistrates, and that they were the most undesirable class of licensed houses in the country. Then they had the large sum of £1,200,000 a year on which capital could be borrowed for the immediate reduction of these houses. Was it nothing to get £1,200,000 a year from the trade to extinguish the worst class of houses? It was at all events a step forward. There was another matter not referred to in the course of the debate, namely, the fact that they were going to prevent in future any monopoly arising from the creation of new licences. [AN HON. MEMBER: No.] Yes, he said that distinctly, and when they came to that clause in the Bill, if there were any Amendments in that direction they would certainly be considered. He asked hon. Members who gave the go-by to those benefits, which were all in the direction of temperance reform, to look at the matter in this way—if thirty years ago when Mr. Bruce brought forward in the House his Bill, which was a great temperance reform measure, such a measure as was now brought in by the Government had been accepted, and if ever since then £1,200,000 a year had been available in the hands of the magistrates for the extinction of licences, including the beerhouse licences, and if for thirty years they had never created new licences or created a monopoly, where would this country have been now? Would it not have been in a far better position for advancing any temperance reform than it was by reason of the proposals which had been rejected from time to time by extreme men on both sides? After all, thirty years was a short time in the life of a nation, and if, looking back over those thirty years, they believed they would have been in an entirely different position if such a Bill as this had been passed, he asked the House to pause before they put into this Bill an Amendment which would largely retard its working and which might, he thought, eventually destroy its usefulness.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs) said that the right hon. Gentleman who had just sat down made one observation in which they were all agreed, and that was that if Mr. Bruce's Bill had been carried into law considerable progress would have been made in temperance reform. He would remind the right hon. Gentleman, however, that Mr. Bruce's Bill contained a time limit and, in fact, that the proposal now before the Committee was on the lines of that Bill. The Amendment before the Committee at the present moment was simply a proposal on the lines of Mr. Bruce's Bill.

Sir EDWARD CARSON said that his recollection of Mr. Bruce's Bill was that it had no compensation fund, but that it gave a fixed period of ten years in which licences could not be disturbed.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said the Amendment before the Committee was considerably more liberal, because it proposed fourteen years, which was a much better proposal. The right hon. Gentleman in the beginning of his speech described this Bill as a Bill for the purpose of giving a right to the owners of licences to insure them. But they had that right at the present moment. The right hon. Gentleman said it was a privilege that was to be extended to them; but it was a privilege that they possessed and exercised at the present moment. There were insurance companies with directors of brewery companies on their boards which insured licences at present. What was the use of a Bill to enable the brewers to do what they could and were doing at the present moment. The right hon. Gentleman quoted Mr. Justice Lindley, and he himself was perfectly certain that every Member on that side of the House would be very pleased to accept Mr. Justice Lindley's definition of what the state of the law was; and he was glad to see that the learned Solicitor-General quoted it with acceptance. The right hon. Gentleman said that according to Mr. Justice Lindley what the licence-holders had at the present moment was a reasonable expectation, and that that expectation was justified by a knowledge of human nature. But the Government now proposed to convert what was an expectation into a property; and that was what they were objecting to. Of course the licence-holders had a reasonable expectation. Take a well conducted hotel in a district where there was a real demand for it. Everyone knew that that licence would be renewed from year to year. It was a perfectly reasonable expectation for the holder of the licence to come to the conclusion that he would hold it for fourteen, fifteen, or twenty years. He could speculate upon it; he might sell it, subject to conditions; and it was perfectly right that the law, if he could materialise, as it were, his expectation, and could sell it, should assess him upon it. But it was a very different thing for the Government to convert the expectation into a property. After all, there was an element of uncertainty in a licence which was absolutely ignored by those who defended the Bill.

At the present moment there was a very important element of uncertainty in every licence, and it was greater the worse the property was. The Government now proposed to deprive those licences of the element of uncertainty. What was it? There was the demand of the neighbourhood, the necessity of the neighbourhood, the knowledge that the magistrates not only could, but were bound to consider the needs of the neighbourhood, and might come to the conclusion that the licence was not the sort of licence they wanted to keep; and, therefore, a house might be deprived of its licence. That was the element of uncertainty. But the

Government now said, "You cannot expropriate a man from his holding without compensation." Was not that converting the licence into a freehold? If a thing which was an annual holding was put into the position of a perpetuity, which they could not expropriate except on payment of compensation, that surely was a freehold. He observed that the word was used by the learned Solicitor-General. He said that the beerhouses of 1869 were freeholds. What was the difference between the beerhouses of 1869 and the property which the Government were now creating under this Bill? He should like to know from any hon. Gentleman opposite if he could point to any distinction between the beerhouses of 1869 and the state of things which would be created by this Bill for all licences. The only difference was that the magistrates might deprive a man of his licence upon payment of compensation. But the public could deprive a man of his freehold property on payment of compensation on proof of public necessity, such as schools, cemeteries, or railways; but that did not make his property less a freehold. The Government were putting licences on exactly the same footing as any other freehold. Take the holder of a living. A man could be deprived of his living for misconduct only. He could not be deprived by a vote of the parishioners on the ground that he was not one of the necessities of the neighbourhood. Otherwise a great many would be deprived from time to time if it were left to the neighbourhood. But that was a freehold, notwithstanding that the holder could be deprived for misconduct. What were the Government doing by this Bill? They were putting licences on the same footing as a living, with the exception that a living was terminable by life, whereas a licence was not terminable by anything. It was a freehold subject to deprivation on proof of misconduct by the man who held it. Was not that a freehold? His hon. friend the Member for Dumfries said that the Bill would stand in the way of all temperance reform in the future, because it would convert licences into freeholds. The learned Solicitor-General asked how was that? He would quote the speech of the right hon. Gentleman's leader, who was probably the highest authority he would accept on this question. Last night, referring to the beerhouses of 1869, the Prime Minister said—

> "It is the freehold tenure of the beerhouses, which, of course, you cannot take away and which was established by Mr. Gladstone in 1869, which has always been the obstacle in the way of temperance reform in dealing with licensed houses."

One day somebody in this House would quote that sentence with simply one alteration, and that would be the name. Someone would say, "It is the freehold tenure of licensed houses, which, of course, you cannot take away and which was established by Mr. Balfour in 1904, which has always been the obstacle in the way of dealing with licensed houses." The case for a time limit and against perpetuity could not be more succinctly put than in that sentence of the right hon. Gentleman.

The Colonial Secretary last night said, and he was so pleased with it that he repeated it twice—he himself was so pleased with it that he would repeat it again—

> "My view of this Bill is, that it is just like the Workmen's Compensation Bill. It is simply putting the burden of compensation upon the trade."

It was a happy illustration; but he would point out that there was a time limit in the Workmen's Compensation Bill. A workman's life was not valued at what it would be valued at law, its full value; it was valued at three years purchase, and not more than three years purchase could be given to a workman under the Compensation Act. The right hon. Gentleman said that there was no right but an equitable claim. Here was the brewer's equitable claim. He lost his licence and his living; but he got not three years purchase, but a full fourteen or twenty-five years purchase. He would ask the right hon. Gentleman was he still prepared to carry out the illustration of the Workmen's Compensation Act? He would further point out that three years was the maximum under that Act whereas the fourteen years in the Amendment was the minimum, because at the end of fourteen years it did not necessarily mean that the licence-holder would be deprived of his living. Not at all. He might go on under certain conditions; but the three years was the limit beyond which compensation could not be given to the workman. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman was as pleased with his illustration now as he was before. If he was, he ought to be a supporter of the proposal in the Amendment. But, after all, said the learned Solicitor-General, this was a modest and effective Bill. About the modesty of it he would have something to say later; as to its effectiveness, he had no doubt it would be effective for the purpose the right hon. Gentleman acclaimed. He was nothing if not open. He was perfectly candid. He said that if this Bill put an obstacle in the way of schemes of temperance reform he hailed it. That was candid and frank. He went through all the schemes of licensing reform, not one of which commended itself to him. Was it not perfectly clear that the Bill was really a Bill to prevent licensing reform in the future.

The Prime Minister yesterday—he listened to him with some sympathy—poured scorn on the clergy. He asked why the clergy should meddle; what did they know about legislation? How long was the Prime Minister of that opinion? He recollected perfectly well not so very long ago the clergy actually indicated the lines upon which a certain Bill should proceed. [Mr. A. J. BALFOUR dissented.] He would beg the right hon. Gentleman's pardon. He must have forgotten; he himself had referred to it so often that he could not possibly forget it, and he certainly hoped to refer to it again. The clergy indicated the lines on which certain legislation should proceed in a resolution in Convocation. Those lines were absolutely followed. They were an authority then, not on high ethical matters in the air, but upon secular matters of legislation. Now they must not interfere at all. It practically meant "I gave you your share; you go on devouring and digesting what I have flung to you; do not be greedy; it is the brewer's turn now, and you must not be jealous." That was really the attitude of the right hon. Gentleman; and he himself rather sympathised with him. Then the brewer said to the clergy, "It is all right; but if you go on like this we will disestablish your Church." And the right hon. Gentleman was with the brewers in that matter. Well, let it go on; it was a very pleasant quarrel; and in those quarrels honest men came by their own, and really they might do so. But let him put in one word for the clergy. After all, the temperance question was a moral question; it affected the morals and good conduct of the community and he believed they had some right to talk on a subject of this sort. He would also put in a word for the temperance societies. It seemed to be assumed that the last people who had a right to speak on this subject were those who had given their lives to the study of it. Temperance societies were not all teetotal societies. The Church of England Temperance Society was not a teetotal society; but its members had given their lives to the study of this one question from a disinterested point of view. They had no interest in it except the interest of the community. They might be right or wrong; but they had no interest except a public one. But the people who were interested in this matter directly would be voting on this very Amendment. The brewery companies were not extreme; they were not included in the extreme men to whom the Solicitor-General referred. The Prime Minister's view of legislation seemed to be, whether it concerned education or temperance, that the only people whose opinion they ought to seek and whose opinion was worth having was the opinion of the people who were either financially or personally interested in the advice which they gave. That was an absurd proposition. At any rate, let them consider the men who had devoted their time quite unselfishly to the consideration of this subject. There was no use talking about this being a modest Bill or a Bill in the interest of temperance. It was perfectly clear what the Bill was. Who was it that said what a pity it was they could not consider the Bill for three minutes free from Party considerations? Here was what was said at a brewery company which met before the Bill was introduced. The chairman said—

> "We mean to have a Compensation Bill, and unless the Government do justice to this trade they will find opposed to them a huge and solid phalanx of common sense and public opinion. Let the Government beware of that array. It

Mr. Lloyd-George.

is a dangerous rock to hurl themselves against, and greater Governments than this have perished in the attempt."

That was from the *Licensing World.* The right hon. Gentleman was steering between this brewery rock and the clerical whirlpool, and he thought the clerical whirlpool was the least harmful. Here was another trade society's declaration, which held this threat out to the Government—

"I do not think the Government will go against the trade, for we put them in power, and if they treat us properly we will keep them there."

That was the meaning of the opposition to the time limit. It was treating them properly in order to keep the Government "there."

"But if they do not we will chuck them out."

The Government were standing drinks to "the chuckers-out" just in order to propitiate them. That was what it meant. The Opposition said, "At any rate, let there be a limit to the quantity." Give them something. He thought, however, it was carrying electioneering in this country rather too far. It was undoubtedly a gross and corrupt practice. The Government had come to the conclusion that as between the clergy and the publicans, the publicans were the better electioneerers; but he did not think that the Government had a right to wreck all hope of temperance reform in the future by means of a Bill of this sort, when they knew they had not the country at their back. They had not received any sanction from the public for it; and they knew perfectly well that if the public had an opportunity of expressing an opinion on it they would soon turn the Government out. All it meant was a threat from the trade to turn them out and the Government said, "Do not put us out in such weather as this; we are not teetotalers and we cannot stand all this rain and water." That was really what it meant. It was all very well to make a great pretence of justice; to talk about justice and equity and all those high-sounding words; but this was not equity; it was electioneering from beginning to end. Property—what was the good of talking about property? Property was a thing that a man had a legal right to. Who had a legal right to a licence? The Solicitor-General and the Colonial Secretary admitted there was no legal right, and Mr. Justice Lindley was quoted to prove that there was no legal right. The Bill was simply a barrier in the way of any legal right to all permanent and effective temperance reform.

MR. GROVES (Salford, S.) said he would venture to answer to the best of his ability statements that had been made by hon. Gentlemen opposite. The hon. Member who had just spoken referred to the certainty of licences being insured against forfeiture for non-requirement. He assumed that the hon. Gentleman was perfectly aware that he had rather overstated his case in claiming that licences could be insured against forfeiture on the ground of non-requirement. He challenged any hon. Member to mention a company which would insure licences on that ground. That was one of the principal clauses which insurance companies now inserted in their policies. Those statements, which had been repeated again and again, were entirely without foundation. It was impossible to effect an insurance with any insurance company for the forfeiture of a licence on the ground of non-requirement. Another mistake made by hon. Members on both sides of the House was in stating that there had been a considerable increase in the number of licences in late years. Those who had any knowledge of the figures would know that there had been a steady and consistent reduction of licences for a long period of years, and that this year the number had fallen below 100,000. That was a point which they ought to bear in mind. Again it had been stated very frequently that brewers were in favour of this Bill and that it was practically a Brewers' Endowment Bill. In speaking of brewers it was well to bear in mind that they were not speaking of individuals, but were dealing with a large body of shareholders numbered by hundreds of thousands, who on the faith of the renewal of licences from year to year had invested their money in brewery securities. Another point on which there had been great misconception was that the publicans, as a body, were in favour of the Bill. He challenged any Member of the House on either side to find a single publican in favour of the time limit as applied in this Amendment.

One point they might congratulate themselves upon during the progress of the debate and that was the statement made in the course of the eloquent and able speech of the hon. Member for the Spen Valley. He stated an entirely new fact of which doubtless he was not previously aware of. He said there were more ways of killing a cat than by hanging. It was quite true. Perhaps the hon. Member had never travelled in a far distant country where in former times the practice of Hara-kiri or the "happy despatch" existed. When a certain person became undesirable, he was invited to make away with himself and to perform the "happy despatch," and he was always presented with a jewelled knife for the purpose. He thought he was not far from the point when he said that by the Bill now before the House, in the gradual extinction of superfluous licences the holders of licences were invited to perform the "happy dispatch," but they were not presented with a jewelled dagger by which to perform the operation. Hon. Members opposite objected to compensation and desired to insert a time limit, which he submitted was altogether inconsistent with the principle of the Bill. What would the representatives of the shipowning, coalmining, or landed interest say if the Government proposed to make them liable to expropriation of their property at the end of fifteen or twenty years? But it was just as proper that it should be said in regard to those interests as to the brewing interest, and he hoped that when the right time came the Government would give due consideration to the suggestions that would be made by the representatives of the owners of licensed property. The present proposal was directed against the very essence of the Bill; it could not be worked in conjunction with the Bill, and if the principle were adopted the measure would have to be entirely redrafted. What had the members of the Radical Party done during the last twenty or thirty years in the direction of temperance reform? They had not lifted their hand for any measure of reform such as the country would accept, and now when a measure of real reform had been brought forward—a measure based on justice and equity—they lifted not their hands but their feet and desired to kick it out of the House.

Mr. CORBETT (Glasgow, Tradeston) said the only persons who regarded this Bill as a temperance measure were connected was the brewing industry. The hon. Member for Salford in declaring that a time limit would be intolerable if applied to the shipowning or coalmining interests, had overlooked the fact that neither of those interests was asking the State to recognise in them a property to which all the Judges declared they had no legal right. Attempts had been made to prove that although there was no legal right to the renewal of a licence, there was such a moral right as to make it a property entitled to recognition; but the arguments by which the contention had been supported were such as would never be admitted in regard to any other property. It was argued, for instance, that because death duties were charged and the property passed from hand to hand that constituted a vested interest entitled to compensation. In the neighbourhood of his own property a public-house was sold for £25,000 more than it would otherwise have fetched on the ground that it was next to a prohibition area. The purchaser would be charged death duties; but no human being would contend that that individual had established any right to demand that he (the hon. Member) should discontinue his prohibitionist policy or pay compensation, and there was no more ground for saying that the persons who speculated upon the probability of magistrates renewing the licences had established any right to compensation. Another curious argument was that because a licence had been renewed for a long series of years a right had grown up which must be fully recognised. On an estate for which he was a trustee, a family of tenant farmers had lived since the year 1178, but nobody would contend that they had thereby acquired rights against the landlord. He regretted to hear the Prime Minister say that the Bishops and clergy had no special qualifications to deal with the provisions of a measure of this sort. The broad moral issue before the Committee was whether they should go backward or forward in the matter of temperance legislation, whether they should declare that the public required extra safeguards against the trade, or that the trade required further protection against the public, and the Bishops and clergy, if qualified to be moral teachers, were surely qualified to have an opinion on such an issue. The Prime Minister appeared to consider that the brewers were the only persons qualified to have an opinion on the subject, because, when he received the deputation from the trade, he was asked to receive also a deputation from the great temperance societies, but he refused the request, and also marked his reply "private" so that the grounds of his refusal could not be communicated. If the Bill were a real temperance measure why should the temperance societies have been refused a hearing while the trade were admitted?

The Solicitor-General had given the most startling reason for the Bill yet put forward, viz., the reluctance of the justices to refuse licences unless they were able to give compensation. The reason given by the Prime Minister and the Home Secretary was not that too few licences had been refused, but that justices had been too precipitate, and had not had due regard for the hardships involved. On that point he had thrown out two challenges, neither of which had been accepted. He had offered, if it could be shown in any of the cases put forward by the trade deputation that the licensee had suffered financial loss, to pay whatever sum the Lord Chancellor declared that individual would have received had this Bill been the law of the land. The trade, however, had failed to bring forward any case of hardship which this Bill would have alleviated. Nearly all the speakers who had tried to prove that the Bill would diminish the number of licences, had gone on the assumption that the quarter sessions would raise the fullest amount in their power. That was certainly not the contemplation of the Bill, otherwise the quarter sessions would not have been given the option of raising no fund at all or of raising only a portion of the maximum amount. It was a significant fact that all those who did not believe in the reduction of licences as a remedy, and who, like the Home Secretary, thought such a step would not reduce intemperance, believed in this Bill. They were sometimes told that in addition to the advantage of reducing licences, this Bill was going to deal justly between man and man. But would it do justice between man and man. Take a brewer in a small town where he had a monopoly. If they took away one of his licences they would actually increase the profits of his business because his trade would not be reduced but his distributing expenses would decrease accordingly. And yet under this Bill that brewer would be compensated upon the market value of that house which he had purchased at a high price in order to maintain his monopoly.

It was said that the licence-holder was going to be compensated out of his own money, but was that so? This tax was not limited to brewers, because hotel and restaurant keepers would have to contribute in such cases as the brewer he had mentioned who would have actually suffered no loss. Under these circumstances they were doing a real service by trying to impose a limit on the operation of this Bill. Nobody would venture to say that as a matter of fact the beerhouses licensed prior to 1869 which enjoyed the greatest security had been the best conducted. Nobody would assert that in those places where the magistrates had been most slack and where the security had been the greatest the conduct of public-houses had been any better. As a matter of fact, the conduct of those houses had not been so good where the magistrates had been slack as in places where the magistrates had been strict. Insecurity generally rested upon the risk that some other individual might take advantage of his opportunities for selfish gain, but the insecurity in regard to this trade rested not upon the charge that anyone might interfere for selfish gain, but upon the charge that magistrates might interfere in the interests of the public, and that was just the sort of interference which led to good management. The passing of this measure in an unlimited form would be, to his mind, one of the very greatest calamities that could fall upon the nation. It was all very well for hon.

Members to pretend that this was a temperance measure; but there were many men and women in this country who had given their lives to temperance work, and it was not saying too much when he declared that not one of those men and women would welcome this proposal, or who would not hail with a sense of relief the limitation of its period of operation.

Mr. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.) said he wished to confine himself to one branch of this question, which seemed to him to be the critical part of the Amendment. The question was whether the system was to be a perpetual one, based on doctrines and grounds which would be equally valid ten, fifteen, or twenty years hence. He would address himself to the question whether the grounds upon which the Government made their proposals were grounds of efficacy or justice or whether it would be better to limit their proposals to such a time as justice required. The question was whether the licensing justices should be empowered by their mere fiat to increase and practically to double the value of the property they were dealing with. When a man was given a licence his property was greatly enhanced in value, and he did not think it was right that any official should be given the power of giving the property of a private individual an increased value in this way. The ground put forward by the Government was that when a licence was granted an expectation was formed that it would be renewed. He did not know what the First Lord of the Treasury meant when he talked about a moral claim. How could there be a moral claim in this matter, because the licence was granted expressly for one year only and no expectation was raised by the form in which it was granted? It was said that the practice had grown up, but that did not constitute a legal right. Surely it was an element in the case that the amplest warnings had been given that licences might be withdrawn without compensation. They had had one Bill after another in which the House had been asked to take away the rights, or the supposed rights, of licence-holders without any compensation. They could not have had a more complete and full notice to licence-holders in this respect than those repeated Parliamentary attempts. The value of a licence was a monopoly value, but that value would be destroyed by increasing the number of competitors.

Not long ago the Liverpool magistrates thought they would do more good by allowing the free sale of drink than by granting a monopoly, and they tried the experiment of giving a licence to everybody of good character who applied for it. In circumstances like that the value of existing licences enormously declined. If a licence-holder had got anything like a legal claim, then it was injured by destroying the monopoly. That was what the Liverpool magistrates did, and that was what any magistrates could do now. If the magistrates to-day were to enormously increase the number of licences in a given area they would decrease the value of existing licences just as effectively as if they removed the licences from the present holders. In that case, would there be any ground for compensation? He thought everyone admitted that there would not. If there was no legal claim in that case where they destroyed the value by increasing the number of licences, why should there be any legal claim when they refused to renew a licence? For the sake of argument, he would admit that the licence-holder had got, not a right, but a saleable interest in his licence, which seemed to be an equitable interest, upon the expectation of renewal, that was upon the idea he had that because it had been the practice to go on renewing licences his licence ought to be renewed. That idea had grown up because the practice had been continuous and because it had been so uninterrupted that it had been taken to be regularly fixed. Everybody admitted that if the licence had been withdrawn this expectation would not have arisen. Surely it was an expectation which was founded entirely on what was represented to be an unbroken rule, and it would be destroyed for the future by the destruction of that rule. The destruction might equally well be done by giving formal notice, and therefore if formal notice were given, and a reasonable time allowed to claim compensation, that expectation altogether disappeared. That was the proposal in Mr. Bruce's Bill. The authors of that Bill said—"We will allow that there is a certain well-grounded expectation. We will recognise that expectation for a certain time, but as we are giving you ample notice that that expectation will not be recognised we shall pay no compensation after a term of ten years." The equitable moral claim depended entirely on expectation. That expectation existed on what was admitted to be unbroken usage. That usage could be broken by giving solemn warning, and the only question was what was the proper length of time during which that solemn warning should be given. His hon. friend the Member for Anglesey suggested that it should be seven years, and his hon. friend the Member for East Dorset suggested fourteen years. It might be one or the other, or it might be a longer term. It might be twenty years, but that was not the point. The question was whether it was their duty to destroy the expectation on which the so-called moral claim was made by giving notice that after a certain time it would not be recognised. He had never been able to understand why a moral claim of this kind should be eternally maintained. It must come to an end if due notice had been given that it would be no longer recognised. He knew, of course, the argument that had been frequently used that licence-holders under this Bill would pay a mutual insurance, and that it was because they were going to do so that they ought to be in exactly the same position at the end of the period as at the beginning. But they had had their *quid pro quo*. Licence-holders would have a *quid pro quo* in that they would be undisturbed during the term of years or receive compensation. That the present proposals were regarded as of benefit to the trade by those who were interested was shown by the fact that brewery shares had risen in price.

The question was asked, What would happen when the time limit expired? During its operation the number of licensed houses would be reduced, though he felt very doubtful whether the reduction they were told to expect would take place. But assuming that it would, it was to be assumed also that the better licensed houses and those which were more wanted would survive, and therefore the chance of licences being taken away when the time limit expired would be a great deal smaller than at present. By that time, too, it would be perfectly easy for licence-holders to insure themselves. He could understand the view that they would get some reduction of licences under this Bill, but he could not understand how it could be supposed that they would be equally free to deal with the temperance problem after this Bill had passed, when they would have created a vast vested interest which did not now exist. This Bill had a past, a very instructive history. It arose out of a deputation which waited on the Prime Minister, and which did not wait on him in the interests of temperance. The problem with which they had to deal was a great one, and many experiments had been tried in different parts of Europe, in America, in Canada, and in our colonies, some of them had been more or less successful. To allow local authorities to try one experiment after another, and to see which succeeded best, was a hopeful method of dealing with the problem, but a Bill like this closed the door altogether on that possibility. They were interdicting the one proper method of dealing with the problem, and they were creating what he might call a wire entanglement in front of the problem. They would indispose the public to listen to any proposition that might be made by creating this enormous preliminary difficulty in the interests of the liquor trade: that was why he so deeply regretted the step which the House was now asked to take. The Solicitor-General said that thirty years was a short period in the life of a nation. He himself was not sure that it was a short period in the life of this country. When he thought of the evils from which the country suffered in every branch of social life in connection with intemperance, he was bound to say that the retarding of temperance reform thirty years was a very serious matter. He confessed that he thought a Bill like this was calculated to throw the greatest possible difficulty in the way of any future reform which might be proposed, and he hoped the House would not take the deplorable step of creating a vested interest for all time.

*SIR EDGAR VINCENT (Exeter) said the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Aberdeen had pleaded the urgency of temperance reform, but it appeared to him that the alleged urgency which he fully admitted was hardly consistent with opposition to the present proposal. Undoubtedly if the Bill were rejected the cause of temperance would be put back, if not for thirty years, at any rate for a considerable period. The right hon. Gentleman asked whether the system of compensation which was now to be established was to be perpetual. The reply appeared to be that the application of the present Bill for a few years would render the further reduction of licences and the consequent compensation unnecessary. In his belief, if this Bill were passed without important modification the licences would be reduced in a few years to the necessary number, and the redundant houses would be abolished.

MR. BRYCE: Does the hon. Gentleman mean by that that no further temperance reform is necessary?

*SIR EDGAR VINCENT said on the contrary he believed that the present measure, so far from blocking the way to further temperance reform, indicated the best path along which temperance reform should proceed. The right hon. Gentleman had stated that it was immoral and wrong by giving compensation to increase the value of licensed houses. He would point out that Clause 4 provided for an entirely new system for the granting of new licences. There had been a great deal of argument as to the abstract right of the licence-holder to get his licence renewed. It appeared to him that the question of abstract right was of infinitely less importance than the practical result of the application of the new Bill. It was clear that the effect of the time limit would be to destroy to a large extent the efficiency of the Bill in the direction of the reduction of licences. The capital powers could not be exercised if the period were reduced to seven years, and if the time limit were extended to twenty years they fell on the other horn of the dilemma by creating an intolerable condition of injustice between the licence-holder who was abolished in the nineteenth year and the licence-holder who was abolished in the twenty-first year. While the former would receive compensation, the presumably better-conducted house, the licence of which was refused in the twenty-first year, would receive no compensation at all. Another great injustice would be inflicted by levying the tax which it was proposed to establish on a licence-holder after the twenty-first year, exposed as he would be to the immediate abolition of his licence without compensation, in order to pay the interest on the capital sum paid to his more fortunate colleagues who had had their licences abolished previous to the twenty year limit. They would thus create a difference between the well-conducted and the badly-conducted houses and give all the advantage to the less well-conducted. Criticism of the Bill appeared to have erred in underestimating the effect of the Bill on one side, and in over-estimating it on the other. Regarded as a measure of practical temperance reform, he thought the merits of the Bill had been very largely undervalued. The fund available for compensation would amount approximately, to 10 per cent. of the present annual value, on which it would be possible to raise a capital sum equal to twenty-five times its amount, or two and a half times the total nominal value of the licensed houses available for compensation purposes. It might be fairly estimated that the compensation price would not be more than ten years purchase, so that the Bill as it stood, the capital powers being exercised, would afford a sum adequate to promote the reduction of the present licences by 25 per cent. Surely even to extreme temperance reformers such a reduction would be adequate.

As to the argument that the Bill blocked the way to further temperance reform, he maintained that, on the contrary, the Bill indicated in the clearest manner the way in which temperance reform could best proceed. If hon. Gentlemen opposite could carry the country with them they had only to take the schedule to the Bill and increase the compensation facilities by increasing the fund from 25 per cent. to 50 or 60 per cent. This would be achieved by increasing the proposed maximum schedule from an average of 10 per cent. to a higher percentage. Arguments had been used pointing to the conclusion that the Bill was bad because it had been well received by the trade. He could not see why the trade was particularly favoured by the Bill. The measure amounted practically to a warning by the community that a reduction in the present number of licences was contemplated and a command to the trade to insure itself against a possible loss to individuals which would ensue upon that reduction. The principle of mutual insurance had been advocated. That was the underlying principle of the Bill. Insurance was not the less valid because imposed by the Government. He appealed to all those who, like himself, were anxious to promote in every practical manner temperance reform and who were totally unconnected with or interested in any brewery concern, to view whatever proposals were put forward in this direction not so much by their effect on the trade as by their probable effect on the community. If it could be shown, as he believed it could, that the result of the application of the Bill would be a large reduction in the number of licensed houses and a probable reduction in the amount of drunkenness, then he contended that the Bill was entitled to their most hearty support.

MR. CHARLES DOUGLAS (Lanarkshire, N.W.) said the question raised by the Amendment was vital to the Bill as a whole. Many Members had argued with great care a question which was not really in dispute, viz., whether or not there was any claim, moral or otherwise, to compensation or consideration in the case of non-renewal of a licence. The only question at present before the Committee was whether the compensation should be restricted or unrestricted. The argument of the Prime Minister was substantially that a time limit would be inequitable because licence-holders, after having been compelled to pay an annual sum, would receive nothing at the end of the period in return for the money they had paid. But the whole theory of compensation by the trade was that those whose licences were renewed were not merely left as they stood but were gainers by the process of reduction. In his judgment it would be wholly inequitable to make one trader compensate another for the loss of his licence unless the former gained by the latter's loss. By diminishing the number of licences competition was reduced, and the profits of the remaining licence-holders were increased, and that was the only equitable ground on which compensation could be asked. The Bill would not only reduce present competition but largely restrict future competition, because there were to be imposed on new licences new conditions which would tend to reduce the number of applicants. In addition to that, the licence-holders who remained would have a much better security for the renewal of their licences than they now had, and that in the opinion of many people, was the main reason for the introduction of the Bill. The licence-holder would receive all these benefits during every year that he paid into the compensation fund, and they constituted a very good return for the payments he was asked to make. At all events, there was nothing in the fact that he had to pay into the fund to prevent Parliament considering, as an entirely separate question, the point whether they should take the opportunity afforded by the readjustment to give fair, and, if necessary, long notice that the present arrangement would be terminated at the end of a given number of years. If they were dealing with property, that would certainly be out of accord with the usual methods of procedure, but the matter here to be dealt with was merely an expectation, and it would be perfectly fair to liquidate that expectation by giving a reasonable number of years notice. If they had a time notice they would have a slower rate of reduction because they would have less funds available. He was bound to say that he thought the estimate of the last speaker was an unduly sanguine one. Surely ten years purchase was not such an unreasonable rate of compensation as had been spoken of by right hon. Gentlemen on the Treasury Bench. If that were so, then the rate of reduction would not be 25 per cent. of the total, or anything approaching it. He admitted that if they had a time limit and gave a time notice that they were going to terminate the present system they would create a new situation. That notice was one of the merits of the proposal to bring an end to the present system, because it created an opportunity of dealing with the situation which really needed fresh treatment. That was the point made by the Solicitor-General that afternoon.

Whatever hon. Members might think of the various methods of reform in detail, it was useful to have an opportunity for dividing opinion between those who thought the present licensing system was good enough and should be continued, and those who believed that a fundamental change was necessary. He confessed that he was only interested in the question as to how this Bill was going to affect the future licensing question in this country. The question of a time limit was not the real question, but what was more important was how far the public would be able to retain the rights they possessed at present, and how far they would be able to control this matter which affected them so closely. One solution mentioned during the debate had been the gradual transfer on fair terms of the licensing trade to disinterested management in some form or other. He regarded that as the most hopeful way of getting rid of the evils which existed in the trade now, without making any revolutionary departure from the present system. He thought such a solution was an essential step to take. It was very easy to say, as the Prime Minister said on the Second Reading, that the whole matter was entirely the fault of the people who drank too much. No doubt it was, but the business of the House of Commons was to do what it could to create circumstances in which there should be less and not more inducements to people to drink too much, and create circumstances in which there would be less abuse of the licensing system. So long as it was to the interest of those who were retailing liquor that their customers should drink more than was good for them, so long would they fail to get the best method of selling liquor which would do the least injury to the community. The real question was whether the future of licensing reform of this kind would be prejudiced by this Bill. Would this measure enhance the value of licences or not? He had in his possession an estimate made for specific business purposes in regard to the value of a number of public-houses in various part of the country, and the value of the licences and goodwill apart from the buildings were put down at something like five years purchase of the net profits. Surely if that were so the fact that they were now proposing to pay ten years purchase was an argument in favour of the contention that this Bill was increasing the value of licences. It was admitted by one of the provisions of this measure that they were going to have a change in the value of licences, because if they were not going to enhance the value of licences what was the meaning of that extraordinary provision that the value of the licences was to be estimated as if the Bill had not been passed. What was the meaning of having that provision in the Bill? Evidently there were two values in view, one representing the value of the licence at the present time, and the other the value which the Bill was going to give it. This was also proved by the fact that they were going to have increased borrowing powers if they did not have a time limit, which would enable them to make larger reductions in the number of licences. Surely this meant that they were going to give a better security.

By this Bill a perpetual right of renewal was created, subject only to good conduct, and when renewal was refused without misconduct there was to be compensation. Whether they called it a freehold or not, the licence-holder would have a very much more valuable security under this Bill than he possessed now, and they were creating for the first time in regard to general licences, as distinct from beerhouse licences, actual property in licences, and they were transforming a moral claim into legal property. The additional value they were creating was an additional obstacle to future reforms, whether they took the shape of local option, municipal management, or public trusts, or whatever way the licences were to be removed from private holders, and this Bill was creating a great additional obstacle unless it contained an element of time limit. If they had a time limit temperance reforms would be possible. The right hon. Gentleman had talked of confiscation, but what could be worse confiscation than to take from the public the right to deal with a trade which had been absolutely in their hands for so many years? Without a time limit this Bill was unrestricted confiscation, and therefore he should oppose it at every stage. He was sure that when the people of this country realised what this Bill meant in regard to the future control of the liquor traffic, they would take a view which would perhaps lead them to deal less leniently with the trade than they might otherwise be disposed to do.

*MR. TRITTON (Lambeth, Norwood) said that as a considerable amount of reference had been made in the course of this debate to the Church of England Temperance Society, perhaps the House would grant a few moments indulgence to one who had been the treasurer of that society for a great many years. The Prime Minister had apparently got the idea that the clergy and Bishops of the Church of England were not to be considered good judges upon any point appertaining to temperance legislation. The Church of England Temperance Society was composed very largely of the clergy, and they had for many years been doing their best to check the drink traffic and to adopt some scheme by which legislative help might be given to that desire. Like many other societies, they were not absolutely unanimous in regard to this measure, and some of them strongly opposed this Bill and desired to see it ended, whilst others, like himself, desired to see the Bill amended and not ended, because they believed that it had very many good points in it. As one who had taken a very considerable and a very deep interest in this question for many years, he looked at the Bill and asked himself how it met the case he had at heart, if at all; what did it do to reduce the excessive number of licences? and he confessed that he thought it did a great deal towards reducing them, and upon that score he welcomed its introduction. He also thought that a licence should not be taken away unless compensation was given, and he had often thought that if he had been a licensing magistrate, which he was not, he would never have consented to put down a man's licence unless the man was compensated. He, therefore, agreed with that part of the Bill; and coming as it did from the trade itself, he could not understand how anyone could object to compensation being given. The one fatal blot upon this Bill was that it mentioned no time at which the right of the publican to compensation should cease. He was not in favour of endowing for all time this trade. He did not agree with the view that when they made a new departure of this kind they should turn an annual licence into a vested interest. Why should they? Why should they go out of their way to safeguard the interests of the drink trade and entrench that trade beyond the reach of harm, and prevent any amendment in favour of temperance reform in the future? He had been told that his view in regard to this was wrong, and as he had been told so by hon. Members who were learned in the law, he would just quote from a speech recently made by one who was also learned in the law, who was a Member of this House, and whose retirement from it he ventured to think was a great loss to this Assembly. He alluded to Sir Edward Clarke. Sir Edward Clarke was speaking at the Albert Hall a few days ago at the annual meeting of the Primrose League, and he said—

> "He thought it was a deplorable thing that a time limit should be suggested by way of amendment. He hoped that this legislation with reference to licences might at least disentangle the Party to which he belonged from its constant connection with the trade. It had not been good for the Conservative Party nor for the trade that the interests of both should have been too closely mingled, but if a time limit were adopted it would be found that during the time, and especially towards the end of the period, there would be a recrudescence of the agitation by a great and important trade, and that they would not be able to do what they might be able this year to do, namely, to put an end finally to the need of appealing to Parliament in respect of these questions."

He himself did not want to see that result. He did not want to see an end of temperance reform. He agreed with the opinion of Sir Edward Clarke as to the disentangling of the Party to which he belonged from its constant connection with the trade, but he did not want to see in this the last year of power of the Conservative Party, before they went out to wander for a long time in the wilderness, this trade entrenched in this way. Had it done any good for the country? Had it helped the material and moral welfare of the country? He would like to have the opinion of the Home Secretary upon that point, for in no other place in the country were the evils of drink so brought home to a man. He saw opposite a right hon. Gentleman whose presence from their discussions he regretted they were soon to lose, and he remembered that in 1893, when the right hon. Gentleman introduced his Local Veto Bill—with which, however, he did not himself agree—the right hon. Gentleman saying that it was what he had seen of the evils of drink during his tenure of office as Home Secretary that had made him a temperance reformer. He asked that there should be no barrier put in the way of temperance reform, and he appealed to the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary to say whether this trade required such tender handling as it was receiving in this Bill. The right hon. Gentleman must allow that all the sad cases which came before him demanding his decision were all more or less connected with this evil of drink. It was because he believed that drink had done more than anything else in the world to send many poor souls to perdition that he earnestly hoped this Amendment might be adopted, and that by this Bill the way might not be barred for ever to temperance reform.

*Mr. HENDERSON (Durham, Barnard Castle) congratulated the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down upon the speech which he had just made, the sting of which, he said, was in the tail. He himself wished to credit all sections of the House with a strong desire to deal with this great social evil, but the question in his mind was whether the scheme before the House contained the right proposals for dealing with this question. It must be admitted that any scheme before it could be satisfactory should have regard to the existing public opinion in the country, and secondly that it ought not to create barriers or restrictions that would make it well nigh impossible for any successive Government to deal with the question. He was inclined to think that this scheme had not the support of public opinion behind it. They all remembered that the Conservative Government in 1895 appointed a Royal Commission to inquire into the administration of the liquor laws, having due regard to the public interest. That Committee reported, and the first conclusion at which it arrived was that a great evil remained to be removed and that hardly any sacrifice would be too great which would result in a marked diminution of this national degradation. The Committee made certain recommendations, which they expected to have the effect of minimising the evil which had been so conclusively proved to exist. Had the Government had any regard to the findings and the recommendations of their own Royal Commission? If this measure was judged in the light of the proposals and recommendations of the Commission, it must be admitted that no heed whatever had been paid to them. He wished they could be satisfied that the Government had paid more heed to the conclusions of their own Royal Commission than they had to the importunity of the trade itself. Not only had they paid no regard to the recommendations of the Royal Commission, but they had paid no regard to the public expression of opinion on the question. The strength of that public opinion was proved by the petitions which had been lodged against this Bill. No such evidence could be found in favour of this scheme. The only evidence in its favour came from those who were interested in passing this Bill through the House of Commons. It ought to be borne in mind that it was possible that public opinion might grow and desire to deal in a more drastic form with this great evil. Any scheme which this House was asked to adopt ought not to erect barriers, impose restrictions, or create any prejudice against its successors dealing with the question. The community as a whole was largely interested in this question, and was greatly affected by it. Therefore the community ought to be taken into consideration in any scheme put forward. They had been told that this was a compromise, but a compromise surely was something in the nature of a concession which ought to be mutual. There could be no compromise in this scheme because the party most interested in it, namely, the community, was not consulted. It could not be a compromise if the public were ignored while the trade was taken into consideration. This was proved by the action of the Prime Minister himself, who, when asked, received a deputation from the trade. That deputation waited upon the Prime Minister, not to make out a case for the reduction of licences, not to urge that the evil should be curtailed, but to report the magistrates who had begun to do their duty to the public and to carry out the first recommendation of the Royal Commission by reducing the number of licences, and upon the *ex parte* statements of that deputation the Prime Minister promised that the question should be dealt with at an early date.

Personally he was not prepared to speak in support either of the Bill or of the present Amendment. Even if a time limit were inserted Parliament would be departing from the principle which had governed the licensing law since 1828, and creating a fixity of tenure which had never yet been held to exist by a Court of Law. Then one of the greatest blots on the Bill was its permissive character. The only thing definitely determined was the restriction of the power of the magistrates. As soon as the question of the public interest came in, and the question of putting the Bill into operation arose, the provisions read, the quarter sessions "may," not "shall," do so and so. The Bill afforded the maximum of protection to the trade, and the minimum of protection to the public. It had been said that under the Bill it would be possible to reduce licences to the extent of 25 per cent., but nobody had dared assert there was any obligation upon the authorities to effect such a reduction. Many of its present opponents would be prepared to support the compensation scheme if they could thereby impose a permanent obligation upon the local authorities to effect a 25 per cent. reduction in the licences. Instead of that, power was to be taken from the local justices and given to the quarter sessions, the members of which might please themselves whether or not they created the necessary fund. So far as he was concerned, he would not accept any compensation scheme hedged round with such provisions as were to be found in the Bill; on the contrary, he would give it his most strenuous opposition. Public opinion on the temperance question had considerably advanced during the last ten or fifteen years Every section of the community was beginning to recognise that the evil of intemperance must be grappled with in the interests of the community as a whole by bringing the licensing authority nearer the people most affected. As one who spoke directly in the name of the workers of the country, he affirmed that from every standpoint the workers were the greatest sufferers from the trade. Of late years a change had taken place in the composition of many benches of magistrates; thanks to a Liberal Government it had been made possible for a certain number of working men to secure seats upon the magisterial bench, and so to introduce the local element into the administration of the licensing law. Under this Bill the little power they possessed was to be transferred to quarter sessions the members of which had lived all their lives in a totally different atmosphere, and the working men were to have no representation whatever. There was not a Labour representative in Parliament who could qualify for a seat at quarter sessions, so absurdly high were the qualifications demanded.

*THE CHAIRMAN intimated that the hon. Member's remarks were hardly relevant to the Amendment before the Committee. The point he was discussing would come up at a later stage.

*MR. HENDERSON said he was endeavouring to point out that inasmuch as the authority was to be transferred from the local bench to quarter sessions, the question of whether the transfer should be for an unlimited period or for seven or fourteen years was of vital importance. However, he would pass from that to his last point, which was that, with the growth of public opinion, everybody interested in the question had been looking forward to the time when there would be introduced a great scheme of constructive temperance reform by which the community as a whole would be enabled definitely to grapple with this evil. That hope would be permanently destroyed by the present Bill, because when once it got into operation, with all its financial and other provisions, any Government which attempted to deal with the question on other lines would be at once met by the cry that they must observe existing contracts—for the Bill would create contracts and give a property that had never been held before. Nothing was so difficult in connection with legislation as to carry a measure which was going to have the effect of upsetting existing financial arrangements. In the interests of the workers he was going to give this measure his strenuous opposition, because he believed that it would not facilitate the reduction of licences. No one would persuade him that members of the trade opposite would come down to the House and give all this attention to promote a Bill which was going to facilitate a reduction of the licences which many of them were interested in. Hon. Members opposite knew full well the permissive character of this Bill, and they knew that the reduction of licences, although small in the past, would be smaller in the future. It was because he believed that the Bill would have this effect that he had determined to oppose it.

*MR. COHEN (Islington, E.) said the hon. Member who had just sat down had attributed to all those who differed from him that they were influenced by sordid motives. He wished to assure the Committee that he had no interest direct or indirect in any brewery companies, and his opposition to this Amendment proceeded purely from considerations of what he considered were the highest principles of justice. He regarded this Amendment and this Bill exclusively from what seemed to him proper and equitable high principles, and it was no drawback to this Bill if it secured those principles and at the same time incidentally benefited brewers or the owners of public-house licences. The hon. Member for Spen Valley, on the Second Reading, said that he was not in favour of compensation, but he consented to it from considerations of policy, and he said that he was willing to consent to compensation as an act of grace. He followed the hon. Member's arguments very closely, but he could not see where considerations of grace would be involved in returning to people that which was their own money and their own property. He regarded that as a matter of honesty, and he declined to regard it as a matter of policy or an act of grace. He had always objected to the maxim that "Honesty is the best policy," because it was wrong to be honest merely because it was, forsooth, good policy. He considered that it was dishonest to deprive even brewers and publicans of property which was their own. The hon. Member who had just sat down said they had been looking forward to a great measure of temperance reform. The hon. Member had not been long a Member of the House, but he had no hesitation in telling him that he would continue to look forward to a great measure of temperance reform if he relied upon those hon. Members who were always advocating drastic temperance proposals. He should not describe the hon. Member for Spen Valley and the hon. Member for Camborne as temperance reformers, but temperance advocates. The most conscientious and the most ardent advocates of temperance reform always seemed to him to support measures which thwarted and prevented temperance reform because they advocated only drastic measures.

The hon. and learned Member for Dumfries delivered a very powerful speech until he arrived at the end of it, when he was led away by the usual temptations of hon. Gentlemen opposite to refer to the last general election. There were, however, one or two observations in the hon. and learned Member's speech to which he should like to reply. He said that the justices in the past had not reduced the number of licences. That was quite true, and that was just one of the reasons why he was supporting this Bill. Hon. Members who had experience of the action of magistrates in petty sessions knew that there was a reluctance on their part to refuse the renewal of licences when there was no discreditable behaviour on the part of the licensee, although they might think there were too many public-houses in the district. There was a natural, and, he thought, almost a creditable reluctance to visit upon well-behaved licensees the loss which would result from that refusal. The hon. Member for the Carnarvon Boroughs said that if they wanted to raise money by mortgages to the total amount of their annual income they would have to spend all that money; and, of course, although they could make a sweeping reduction of licences they would come to an end of their resources. That argument was irrelevant. He said so because he had never heard of any proposal in any portion of the United Kingdom to hypothecate the total amount of money at the command of the magistrates for the removal at one fell swoop of all the licences which would come under the scope of the Bill. He considered that sound finance required that they should only mortgage part of their income, and that they would reserve something as a nest egg to continue the extinction of licences when the first outlay of capital had expired. He, personally, was not a tremendous believer in salvation being got from the reduction of licences. For twelve years on the London County Council he had opposed the abandonment of licences in connection with the properties of the Council. In the last ten years eighty-two licences had been abandoned by the County Council at a cost to the ratepayers of £272,000. That, to his mind, had only retarded temperance reform, because the policy pursued had made more valuable the surviving licences in the neighbourhood. The result was that they would have to pay more for them when they came to extinguish any of them. He could not understand why some hon. Members so much desired to deprive licence-holders of compensation. The refusal to give compensation reminded him of the days when highway robbery prevailed in the country. Then a man went up to another, and pointing a pistol at him, said, "Your money or your life." That, at least offered the victim a choice. Now it appeared the hon Member opposite wanted both the money and the life, as they took the money in the shape of rates and then desired to confiscate the licence after a given time. He felt sure that this Bill would be an important step in the direction of true temperance reform, and he hoped it would be followed by other measures in the same direction. He would vote against the Amendment for a time limit.

*MR. LYELL (Dorsetshire, E.) said it was a matter of surprise to him to find how widely hon. Members on both sides of the House differed on this question, in view of the fact that they had so much common ground to start from, and that they travelled so far along common lines of thought in their efforts to find a solution. They were all agreed that there was too much liquor consumed, and, if anyone had any doubt on that point, he could refer to the records of the hospitals, lunatic asylums, and jails. If he did so he would not have any doubt on the subject any longer. They were all agreed that there was too much money spent on liquor, and that was a point which, he thought, had not received so much attention as it deserved. It had been proved that there were many people earning from 24s. to 30s. a week spending 6s. to 7s. a week on liquor, and that without incurring any reproach whatever from neighbours and friends of being drunk. There was nothing more certain than that money spent on liquor, which was a luxury, was money not spent on food, clothes, proper housing accommodation, and the necessities of life, without which no family could be brought up in such a way as to afford the expectation or the chance of their becoming efficient citizens in the future. They were all agreed that there were too many licences. Some hon. Members on the other side of the House thought that a reduction of licences might not necessarily mean a reduction of the amount of liquor consumed or of drunkenness. If that were the case it only proved that the unnecessary licences were much more unnecessary than even he and his friends thought they were. The object of all hon. Members was to effect a reduction in the number of licences in London and elsewhere with as little hardship as possible to all concerned. The Government proposal had been laid before the House, and it had been said for it that in London a reduction of 25 per cent. might be secured by its operation; but, with all due deference to the opinion of the hon. Member for East Islington, he ventured to say that that could not be done without borrowing and spending up to the hilt the capitalised fund for paying the compensation. And how long were they to suppose it would be possible before a new capital fund would be available for any further reduction? A hundred, eighty, or sixty years? And were they to sit down with folded arms to wait for all these years before any further reduction could be undertaken? On the other hand, on that side of the House a time limit was proposed as a solution of the difficulty. Well, the Government refused to accept this solution. And on what ground? They regarded it as wanting in equity.

What was there inequitable in a time limit if the time was a fair one?

He could not help feeling that a great deal of the difficulty arose from a certain amount of confusion of thought in the minds of hon. Members opposite. One after the other got up and confessed—some of them reluctantly—that there was no property in a licence, and yet these same hon. Gentlemen all the time were unconsciously thinking of a licence as property. They had been told that a licence was property or quasi-property from the point of view that it was dealt with by the officers of the Inland Revenue on the basis that there was an expectation of renewal; but no one had ever considered that there was an expectation of a renewal of an ordinary public-house licence for more than fourteen years, and fourteen years was precisely the term proposed by the hon. Member for West Dorset as the number of years purchase or grace. But the Government had put forward the idea that there might be gross injustice in one man losing his licence just before and another just after the expiry of the time limit. He failed to see any injustice in that whatever. They were not going to follow the principle of the parable in which one man was paid a penny for one hour's work, and another man only received a penny for twelve hours work. In this case one man had thirteen and a half years profits, and if he lost his licence he was surely not going to be compensated at the rate of fourteen years profits for the loss of six months profits. If the other man lost his licence after fourteen and a half years he was to get nothing at all because he had received fourteen years gross profits. He failed to see any injustice in that at all. On the contrary, it seemed to him to be a very adequate measure of justice.

Then as to the question of the remaining houses, hon. Members opposite had, time after time, spoken as though this was a question of insurance, and insurance only. But there was another aspect of this levy on the houses which were going to be left. He ventured to think that it was something in the nature of an increased premium paid in return for an increased monopoly. And here they had one of the typical injustices of this Bill illustrated. The areas in which the levy was to be made were not scientifically adjusted. Take the county of Dorset, for instance, part of which he had the honour to represent. The number of licences to population through the country districts was not conspicuously great, though he was not quite sure whether it would satisfy the requirements of the Minority Report of the Peel Commission. But the old parts of Poole and Weymouth were largely over-licensed—the proportion being one to every 163 of the population in Poole. When a question of reduction went to the quarter sessions Poole had not a single magistrate on that Court. The county licensed houses were mainly well conducted, and their risk of non-renewal was very small. Why should they be assessed to contribute to the reduction of licences in Poole and Weymouth where nine-tenths of the licences might be swept away in these towns without putting another pennyworth of business into the pockets of the country licence-holders. That would be a very gross injustice to the country licence-holders. But if the area in which the levy was made were more scientifically adjusted and the levy made on the remaining licences in the towns to pay compensation for the licences suppressed, there would be no injustice, and the amount of the levy and probably more would be automatically returned to the pockets of the remaining licence-holders in the increased profits they would earn.

Lastly, there was the question raised of undesirable tenants taking up licences during the last year or two of the time limit. He did not think that that was a question which could seriously affect the case. The law was there which could control the licences, and if the law was inadequate it could very easily be strengthened, and if the law were enforced brewers would not put in men who would lose them their licences. Moreover, it would not be known necessarily that a particular house was going to be suppressed. Indeed, it would be found that it was to the interest of the licence-holders not to conduct their houses badly but to compete with each other as to who was going to conduct his house best so as to secure a renewal of his licence. The hon. Member for Carnarvon had stripped the flimsy pretences thrown over the Bill. The hon. Member called it an electioneering Bill. He quite agreed; but he did not agree with the hon. Gentleman when he said it was a good electioneering Bill; on the contrary, he thought it was an uncommonly bad electioneering Bill. Let him get the publican in a quiet corner, where there was no one around to take the news to the brewer, and ask his opinion, and he would find that the unsophisticated publican had a very shrewd idea indeed of the Bill, and had no delusion as to the solidarity of interest as between himself and the brewer. He ventured to think that at the next general Election the effect of the Bill would be more far reaching than the Government imagined.

*SIR MARK STEWART (Kirkcudbrightshire) said he thought that there was considerable confusion of ideas on both sides of the House with reference to this Bill. Directly the Government brought in the Bill it was received on that side with acclamation. It was thought by the country to provide a great want; but although its general principle was approved, it was felt that there was something lacking to make it a perfect measure. From recent experience, and throughout his life, he had been quite consistent in regarding compensation with a time limit as essential. He had argued the matter when no one was willing to hear him; he had fought elections on it, and might have to fight elections on it again; and he had won on principles which were repugnant to many, but which he had endeavoured to make as palatable as he could. In many parts of Scotland there was a strong feeling that a publican ought not to be dispossessed without compensation; and as the Bill gave compensation, he did not think it should be rejected in the summary manner advocated by hon. Gentlemen opposite. During the twenty-five years he had sat in the House, he had seen Bills which might have proved most useful rejected. He recognised in this Bill a real attempt on the part of the Government—and he gave them every credit for the attempt—to put down the number of public-houses where they were not necessary or useful. He was not one of those who thought that the working classes wished for a moment to be without public-houses. He knew perfectly well they liked public-houses; and a public-house conducted in moderation would be most useful in a district. But there were a number of bad low public-houses which were not necessary, and which ought to be at once put down. There was no machinery at present to do that. The licensing magistrates in England would not do it. He himself had gone down from London to Scotland to oppose a licence; but the licence was afterwards replaced by the licensing justices. That was unsatisfactory. The licensing justices would not act because they did not like to take away a man's living without compensation.

So far he spoke in praise of the Bill. Now he had to take a different view. Would the public benefit from this Bill as they should? Here was a great monopoly confined to a very few, and protected by very careful laws, in order that those who had licences should manage their houses properly. At present, a licence could not be said to be a freehold or a vested interest; but if the licences were to be perpetuated their value would be increased enormously. Was not the country justified in asking, if this enormous profit were to be made, that it should have some hold on the licences. Giving licences in perpetuity was what moderate temperance reformers could not stand. He was not now speaking of any particular church or class. He had been a member of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, but he had also access to a fair amount of information from Dissenters. The great Nonconformist body, the United Free Church of Scotland, held its General Assembly at the same time as the Church of Scotland; and he knew the feelings of hundreds of these men. They were unanimous in saying that they could not approve of this Bill without a time limit. They were really interested in the matter on behalf of their flocks and congregations; and to ignore such public opinion was to throw away an opportunity to gain knowledge, which was a very great loss in considering a question of this sort. When they went deeper and asked individuals what they thought of this Bill in which they were all concerned they would find that the people knew all these things far better than English legislators could explain them; because the Scotch were far ahead of the English in these matters and could explain these matters far better for themselves than they could be explained in an heated debate in this House. He implored the Government to consider this matter. It was out of the question to say they could not graft a time limit on to this Bill. How could it be said that in fourteen years time this Bill would have done its work. Would an Act hold good for fourteen years without amendment? It might require revision and that was all he asked for. They might call it a time limit, or revision, or what they liked, but that would satisfy the country to some extent. If a time limit were not incorporated the result would be that the moderate temperance party, which embraced many thousands of voters, would take a line of their own at the next election and would silently vote for the policy in accordance with their views on this question. There was nothing which troubled Scotchmen more than religion and politics; they cared little about other matters, but if once strife was stirred up in either religion or politics they would fight to the last gasp. He appealed to the Government to give the matter more consideration. The Bill would go through far more easily and in far less time if some assistance was given in the way of a time limit. Let the Government call it what they liked, but let them give something by means of which their supporters could assure their constituents that they were not handing over any property or vested interest to the trade.

*MR. HELME (Lancashire, Lancaster) said the clause to the Amendment which the Committee was now asked to consider, appeared to him to propose such a drastic change in the law that he was a little astonished to hear the hon. Member for Stretford say that he was surprised that temperance reformers wished to mutilate a Bill of this sort. Outside this House a strong public opinion had shown itself. In the numberless petitions that had been presented, the Committee had evidence that there was a growing feeling that the proposals of this Bill were not supported by public opinion outside. A duty, therefore, seemed to be thrown on the Committee to endeavour to meet this by, at any rate in this House, appealing to the Government not to throw away the opportunity still within their grasp. So far as he could make out, this opinion centred itself in the strong objection to destroying the discretion which the justices had hitherto exercised in giving or withholding a licence. If the Committee looked for a moment at the grounds on which these licences were granted they would be bound to admit and recognise that it was not the private interest of the applicant that was considered, but the public need of the locality, and for that reason a licence was granted for a year, and a year only. In his opinion the magistrates had not exercised their discretion ruthlessly and without consideration to the trade in the past. There was a feeling that in each case justice must be done, and that there must be no partisanship. Many of his constituents who differed from him, and had done their best to prevent him sitting in this House, were now pressing him to the utmost extent in their power to secure an alteration in this Bill by the introduction of a time limit, and were urging him to amend and even, if necessary, obstruct the passage of the Bill in order to bring about that result. The desire of the public to deal justly with all interests concerned must be admitted. The public authorities could always afford to be generous in dealing with such a question as was now before the House, but he honestly believed that public opinion had formed a stern resolve and that it would re-assert itself, if thwarted now, and insist upon controlling the drink traffic. He, therefore, thought the Government was unwise in the course it was pursuing.

On the previous evening the Prime Minister had said that if it was proposed that the public should pay this insurance, the attitude of the Government would be different in respect to the question of the time limit, and had asked was it right and fair, considering the fact that this sum of money was to be drawn from the trade, to press for a time limit? He certainly thought it was because the extraordinary profits that could be made by the licence-holder were due to the power given to him by which he was subjected to no competition in respect of the sale of drink, and therefore, in his opinion, the public had a legitimate claim to a portion of the profits made in exchange for the monopoly which had been conferred upon the licence-holder. The Government ought to realise that the general welfare of the community had as much right to be considered as the pockets of the licence-holders. The policy behind the Bill would obstruct the progress of reform, and he submitted that it would have been quite sufficient had the Government provided a compensation fund, drawn from the trade, and placed it at the disposal of the magistrates without any limit on their discretion. The magistrates had always desired to deal fairly with the interests of the individual, and they could have been trusted to exercise their discretion fairly. Moreover other trades had to insure against certain contingencies, and it would have been perfectly easy for the liquor trade to secure itself against the arbitrary exercise of the powers of the local Bench. Of late years there had been a gradual giving up of licensed houses which had become effete or worn out, but that process would now be stopped, because the houses would be given a permanent value which did not formerly exist. Parliament ought not to block the way, and thus render more difficult the carrying out of a wise and careful scheme for the improvement of the liquor trade. He deprecated Members being so filled with the Party spirit as to permit a system of "see-saw" legislation by which legislation forced through by a mechanical majority now, in spite of the protest of the Opposition, had on a future occasion to be repealed or materially altered by another Parliament. If practicable he would propose a time limit in connection with the schedule, so that the amounts payable under the Bill would be fixed only for a certain number of years. The country would then be given an opportunity of reconsidering the position, if the Government still refused a response to the appeals which had been made from both sides of the House, and a future Parliament be spared the necessity of adopting a system of high licence fees as a punitive measure rendered necessary by the policy of the present Bill.

And, it being half-past Seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

LICENSING BILL.

Considered in Committee:—

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 1:—

Amendment again proposed—

"In page 1, line 5, to insert, at the beginning, the words 'During the period of seven years after the passing of this Act.'"—(*Mr. Ellis Griffith.*)

Question again proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Amendment again proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"To leave out the word 'seven,' and insert the word 'fourteen.'"—(*Colonel Williams.*)

Question again proposed, "That the word 'seven' stand part of proposed Amendment."

*MR. A. K. LOYD (Berkshire, Abingdon) said if only those who were against this Bill were in favour of a time limit, he, being in favour of the Bill, would have been content to give a silent vote against a time limit. But he had been much impressed by the fact that many of those who agreed with this measure in its principle and its scope were desirous of seeing a time limit engrafted on it. The argument in favour of a time limit proceeded on the assumption that a time limit for compensation for the non-renewal of a licence was exactly similar in its effects to a notice to terminate an agreement. The proposition of the right hon. Member for Aberdeen that the claim for compensation rested entirely on expectation, and if only a reasonable notice to terminate that expectation could be given no hardship could arise, was based on entirely fallacious reasoning, because, in the first place, a great deal of the claim rested on the compulsory outlay and continued outlay up to the very end of the period. Moreover, under a notice to terminate an agreement or expectation the person under notice knew the exact date of the end of his interest, and as it approached could curtail his expenditure, withdraw, and re-invest his capital and minimise his losses in every way; but under a time limit for compensation for non-renewal of a licence a totally different position was presented. The licence-holder was ignorant as to whether he would or would not be deprived of all further interest, and, until the blow fell, would be not only unable to curtail outlay and withdraw his capital, but compelled to continue his outlay in order to keep his premises suitable for their purpose. Under those circumstances it was not possible for the licence-holder to regard a time limit as an opportunity given to him to enable him to minimise his losses and so protect himself from a fixed future disability. Here, both the fixed date and the liberty to curtail outlay would be wanting. So much, for the underlying fallacy of treating a time limit to compensation as equivalent to a notice to end an agreement. Now what were the arguments for the time limit itself? It had been argued that there was no right to compensation at all, and hon. and right hon. Gentlemen had frequently said that there was "no right," "no property," "no vested interest." The Government had been accused of conferring for the first time a right and creating vested interests where none existed. But the people of this country believed a great injustice was being done; that a loss was being sustained by the licence-holder for the public good through no fault of his own, and it was that which was the basis of the compensation which was being called for throughout the country. The public cared no more for these distinctions as to "vested interests," "rights," or "properties," than they did for a metaphysical discussion, and if the Committee could be spared all these refinements about vested rights, property, and the like, an immense deal of time and labour would be saved.

Another argument adduced was that this Bill interfered with the discretion the magistrates had exercised from time immemorial; and that was a plausible argument because, in a way, the discretion to which it was now found necessary to append this compensation was the same discretionary power which had long been exercised without any such compensation. But what was left out of sight was the fact that the discretion of the magistrates up to within recent years was exercised on grounds entirely different to those on which it had come to be exercised since. Thirty years ago and till recently, the only grounds upon which magistrates refused to renew an existing licence were either that the house was grossly misconducted or unfit, or that the premises were "unnecessary." In those days, "unnecessary" meant that the premises were no longer required to be used as a public-house, because business had receded from them; population had moved away from the locality, and the expense of police supervision was out of proportion to the public convenience to be served by the renewal. Those facts used to be brought to the attention of the magistrates by the police, and the magistrates found as a fact that the premises were unnecessary and refused the licence. Nobody ever suggested that a licence refused under such circumstances should be compensated for. But in recent years the discretion of the magistrates had begun to be exercised under a lively sense of responsibility for the moral well-being of the community, and from a very high sense of the importance of the reduction of licences as a step in that direction. Thus it was that their discretion was not only used in the case of what might be called those derelict houses from which trade had receded, but in connection with those which though doing a good business were "not required" in the sense that they bore too large a proportion to the population. His sole ground for wishing to see this matter settled was that now this discretion was being exercised as part of a great temperance movement and the magistrates were only prevented from exercising it to a larger extent by the fact that they felt that it must now be exercised on going concerns and not those which were in the old sense of the word "unnecessary," and that they could not exercise it without inflicting very grave loss on the man whom they damnified, and who had done nothing to deserve it. Their sense of justice was outraged by the fact that they could not exercise their descretion on modern lines without inflicting harm on a very deserving class of men.

He did not agree with the hard terms that were flung at the licensed victualler's trade. The trade existed to meet a public demand and was carried on under police and magisterial supervision and he doubted whether there was a man in the House who at some time or another had not been glad to avail himself of the shelter of a public-house or an hotel either at home or abroad. It was not fair only to dwell upon the black side of the case and describe all these houses as being engaged in a "hellish traffic." This sort of bitter and unjust abuse could only be directed to creating prejudice and making the Committee indifferent to the question of whether injury and injustice was inflicted upon the persons so spoken of. He associated himself most earnestly with every attempt to see this traffic carried on under proper conditions, but he objected to these men being described as following any but a respectable calling. Exception had been taken to the Government speaking of this Bill as a temperance measure. Nobody had suggested that the deputation from the trade which waited on the Prime Minister was actuated in so doing by a desire to promote temperance. But the deputation was caused by the fact that the discretionary power of the justices was being exercised not merely upon "unnecessary" licences in the old sense of the term, where business was extinct, but upon houses in the full swing of business which were "unnecessary" only in the modern temperance reform sense by the population scale. And temperance reform (on modern lines) was being retarded owing to the magistrates feeling the difficulty of applying their discretion to "unnecessary" public-houses, in the new sense of the term. Now when this was brought to the attention of the Government why were they not entitled to say they would produce a measure to remedy the existing state of things, and by releasing the dead-lock give a fresh impetus to temperance reform. It was argued in favour of the time limit that this Bill as it stood would tie the hands of future Parliaments. That was an absolute impossibility. Any Member who did not like an Act was at liberty to try and change the law. If public opinion called for a change in the licensing laws, it would be as open to Parliament to make that change as it was to them to make the present change. All that this Bill did was to put the publican, who had been up to now in a most anomalous position, into a position of being compensated for any damage he might sustain on public ground and without fault from a refusal to renew his licence. It was also said that after a time all the redundant licences would be suppressed, and that there would be no further occasion to reduce licences; and, therefore, no occasion to compensate. If that were so, the time limit now asked for would be automatically applied and therefore it was not necessary to incorporate it in the Bill. But if the need for reduction continued he could not understand the argument that something was to be done now to relieve the magistrates of a dilemma but that we should enact that at the end of a certain time that dilemma should be revived. The Bill was modelled on the principles of elementary justice and no time would come in the future when it would be just to insist upon continuous outlay and a high standard of excellence up to the moment of deprivation and then suddenly destroy the business on public grounds only, without any compensation. The compensation was to be raised from the trade itself. To put a time limit on the Bill was, he thought, a great mistake, and he should feel compelled to vote against it.

MR. HARWOOD (Bolton) said the hon. Member who had just sat down seemed to have spoken under an entire misapprehension. He had said that they did not care about rights or property. But the whole thing was a matter of property. It was a matter of money, and whilst hon. Members on that side of the House were perfectly prepared to do what was right to the publican they had also to consider the public. It was all very well to say that they did not care about rights, but that was exactly what they were there to discuss. He believed in public-houses and he would be very sorry to live in a country where no public-houses existed. He was opposed to local veto; and was of Dr. Johnson's opinion that an inn was the only place in the world where one could be absolutely certain of having a welcome when one came and where they would be sorry to see one leave. This discussion had shown the delicacy of the position in which the Opposition were placed in arguing this question, because there were two senses to the term "time limit," and they had been confused throughout the debate—the first was applied to the Bill and the second was applied to compensation. The Amendment technically before the House referred to the time limit in connection with the Bill and suggested that the Bill should be for seven, fourteen, or other number of years. It had been said if there was a time limit it would be unfair to the licence-holders, who would pay for a long time upon their licences and then when the time came for them to be got rid of they would get nothing in return, but that was the question of the time limit with reference to compensation. It was most unfair to talk about a time limit as if it would do some injustice. The question was whether the Bill should be for seven years or other period or for an indefinite time. No time limit in that sense could cause injustice to be done to anybody. Those who had been compensated would have gone and those who had not would have remained in a better position than they were before, because they would have gone through the zone of fire and would have got a reputation for respectability and good conduct which would enable them to obtain licences far more easily than now. He was perfectly certain that it would be an immense relief to great bodies of the Government's own supporters—he could speak for those in his own constituency—who had faith in the experiment if they could feel that it would not commit them in perpetuity. The Prime Minister had said that there had been a great mistake made in the past in dealing with the licensing question generally and that it would be very difficult to go back upon what the nation had done wrong in the past. In the past they had allowed a number of people to have the use of valuable property without paying enough for it, and now the Bill proposed to hand over the fee simple of the property to them. The time limit was at the very genesis of the Bill itself. They were going to do away with bad houses, but there would come a time when they would have reduced licensed houses sufficiently. He warned hon. Members on the Liberal side that the public would not stand unlimited reduction of public-houses. Within a reasonable time the licences would have been reduced to a sufficient extent and what was going to happen after that?

It had been said that the reduction of licences had been proceeding very slowly. The majority of the reductions made in the last few years had been made by the voluntary giving up of poor houses by the trade. The tied-house system had altered the whole character of licences. Brewers had got a number of houses that did not pay and they were getting rid of these, or only keeping them on to prevent other people having houses. Since, however, these brewers had heard the words of the Prime Minister, promising to bring in a Bill, they had recognised that these non-paying houses had a value. This was a very serious aspect of this question. They would have a great number of wretched and worthless houses perpetuated because they had a value under the Bill. They would have got them for nothing if they had waited, but under the Bill they would have to pay a preposterous price for them. The result of the Bill would be that the public in the future would have to buy back from the trade the licences, which they now proposed to make freehold, at their enhanced value, and in that way it would be the public who would have to pay compensation in the end. The public, in fact, were going to be done. He did not say they were going to be done intentionally, but that would be the result.

It was a possibility that the great masses of the people might in the future take this matter into their own hands. The working classes were the customers now, and they were the managers, but in the future the working classes would want to manage as well as be customers, and would want better public-houses and better liquors. He wanted to see liquor sold at an honest, decent, and fair price, and the Government by this Bill were putting a barrier in the way of that. They were saying that the people should never have facilities to take the matter into their own hands, and the people would feel resentment and anger when they discovered the hedge which had been set up round their freedom of action. The Prime Minister stood up like Jane Shore in a white garment to defend his illogical position which they were now trying to remedy. Well, he remembered, when he was a boy, a man being granted a licence in the neighbourhood in which he lived. His father was one of the magistrates, and the man came to him afterwards and said, "Mr. Harwood, you put £3,000 into my pocket." It turned out to be rather more, but that remark induced him to ask himself why they should put thousands of pounds into people's pockets in this way. He wanted to put the same question to the First Lord of the Treasury now. For his own part, he felt so strongly the undesirability of making elasticity impossible in the future, that, out of consideration for those who had invested their money in the business, he was prepared to go a long way in the matter of compensation—even to the length of finding compensation out of national funds—rather than have the time limit done away with, for that would make it impossible to have elasticity in the future. He begged the Government not to make it impossible in the future to remedy the mistakes of the past, but to put this business at last on a sound footing.

SIR PHILIP MUNTZ (Warwickshire, Tamworth) said that having during the last few weeks studied this question very closely, he should support the Bill, which he considered would promote temperance reform. If he were to say what he thought about the time limit, he would not be able to confine himself to Parliamentary language. He thought it was one of the most discreditable suggestions that had ever been made in that House. Under it, after a given period a man who made the insurance would be robbed of the benefit of the premiums he had paid. He could not conceive how such a proposal could be made by any fair-minded man. If a time limit were introduced this question would not be disposed of now. It would come up again. The trade was a great power. It would ask who had passed the Bill containing the time limit which robbed it of its premium; and it would answer, "The Unionist Party." That was why hon. Members opposite had introduced the Amendment. They had introduced it to create a split between the Unionist Party and the trade. The publicans would blame the Unionist Party. That was the strongest argument—one of the strongest arguments—against passing the time limit. If the Unionist Party did not reject the limit they would suffer, and justly suffer, for having consented to one of the most dishonest suggestions ever made in that House.

MR. THOMAS SHAW (Hawick Burghs) said that judging from the speech to which they had just listened, this debate had lasted none too long. The Committee were gradually getting at the truth of the situation. According to the hon. Gentleman who had so powerfully and so incisively addressed them, and who had been rendered practically speechless by the proposal, Parliamentary language was not sufficient to convey the full force of his sentiments to the House. The offence of the time limit was that it would cause a split—Oh, sad disaster!—between the Unionist Party and the liquor trade. No wonder the hon. Gentleman was well nigh speechless. The Unionist Party was in danger of being disrupted from top to bottom. A split with the trade meant wreck and political ruin, and anything which savoured of a bait to detach any Member of the Unionist Party from that alliance between a sectional interest and the State alarmed the hon. Gentleman whose speech had formed so interesting a contribution to the debate. But the remarks of the hon. Member who had just sat down had little to do with the merits of the time limit itself. They were rather concerned with tactical considerations affecting the Unionist Party. The time limit went down to the root of the situation, and involved no less a question than whether the trade was to be the master of this Government and country, or the Government and the country were to be masters of the trade. He hoped he would be able to express his views in Parliamentary language, but he was bound to say he much regretted the attitude of the Prime Minister, who had definitely announced that there was to be no compromise on this matter. One satisfactory feature of this debate was that, so far as the law on the matter was concerned, nobody was in doubt. His hon. and learned friend the Member for Dumfries had stated the whole situation with regard to the question of compensation and with regard to the legal position of the licensed victualler, and he confessed he heard with not a little satisfaction the speech of the Solicitor-General, because it did not controvert by one iota the proposition laid down by his hon. and learned friend. What the right hon. Gentleman did say was that there was no right of property, and that there was only a licence. The right hon. Gentleman quoted with approval, and if he might presume to say so, he entirely assented to the citation from that distinguished judge Lord Lindley, who declared that the nature and quality of the thing on which he was inquiring was a certain expectation on the part of the licensee that his licence would be continued. How had that expectation arisen? It had not arisen from the action of Parliament, and he would put the matter in this way: Suppose Parliament wished to-day to confer on any person the right to carry on a business, and to make it clear that it was not a right in perpetuity, or in the nature of property, it could only be done by Parliament declaring on the face of the document that it was a licence, and, if it was desired to make it clear beyond all question that there was no perpetuity, by stating on the face of the document that the licence was for one year only. That was what Parliament had done in this case, and he saw no legal or moral ground for a person whose licence was thus limited by Parliament claiming compensation as if it were a perpetual right.

The Prime Minister said that at the end of the time limit the same question would emerge. He perfectly appreciated the position taken up by the Prime Minister in his speech. His own view of the time limit was simply this: Owing to what had been done in the history of the licensing question, the local authorities had, so to speak, conducted themselves with such exuberant confidence in the trade, and with such a constant desire not to injure the trade, that gradually the trade had conceived the notion that it had, as against the Government and as against this House, a right which it ought to be compensated for. In short Parliament had in practice been disabled in this matter, but that disablement did not exist in law, and it never existed in imagination until a short time ago. What was the answer made in the discussions on local veto? It was that the present law, if properly administered, was sufficient. The Unionist Party, now in danger of this split, announced that principle so continuously and so vehemently that at last the justices thought there might be something in it, and they began to administer the law as they found it. They discovered certain overlapping, a certain oversupply in particular districts of the country. Then they were checkmated by the Prime Minister. That was the situation and nothing else than that. The Prime Minister scolded the justices of the country for the exercise of their rights. The announcement of the right hon. Gentleman produced an instant arrest of the reduction of licences, and now he came forward with this Bill, backed by the entire power of the trade, for temperance reform. All the strong language, "uttered or unexpressed," about temperance reform, about the avoidance of robbery and the like, made no impression when they considered that what was proposed to be done was simply to carry on the campaign started by the Prime Minister, who was checkmating the actual and steady and growing reduction of licences by a measure of this kind. What did the time limit mean? It might appear to many minds that from the practice that had gone on Parliament was in a measure disabled from revoking the licences it had granted. The meaning of the time limit was simply that it was a notice to the licence-holders that at the end of a fixed time they must consider that disablement had disappeared and that Parliament had resumed the absolute freedom to recall what it had an absolute freedom to grant. The time limit seemed to him to be the only convenient method by which

Parliament and the local authorities under Parliament could revindicate and reassert for themselves that power which was contained on the very face of the licence—the power of declaring that a thing granted for a year should never be relied upon, against the funds of this country or of anybody, for more than a year.

He was against the idea of compensation, believing there was nothing to give compensation for. He did not think the Bill was a compensation Bill. It had been rightly described as a compulsory insurance Bill; and that was what made the Bill, to his mind, a perfect surplusage in legislation, because if Parliament chose to effect its reform and not to compel insurance, the trade was astute enough, clever enough, and well advised enough to insure itself up to the hilt. Still, when compensation was in the field he wished the question to be fairly treated, and he would vote for fourteen years. His hon. and learned friend the Member for Stretford had given the Committee the advantage of his experience in arbitration, and had said that under the Lands Clauses Act these licences had been valued, roughly, at about ten years purchase. In the North he might say that that figure was not reached. It was considerably less than that, and he was told that in Ireland it was still less. He would take it at ten years purchase. He would put this question to the Government: If Parliament is getting quit by ample notice of its disablement, how can there be any claim to a longer notice than four years beyond the full purchase price of any licence? The time limit was simply a declaration by Parliament that at the end of that time the state of matters existing before the action of the justices was arrested at the hands of the Prime Minister would be resumed. He had great difficulty in understanding the language of the Prime Minister with regard to the clergy of all denominations, of whom he said that when they came to discuss the purely secular methods by which Parliament ought to deal with questions of legislation affecting the public at large, their training gave them no special title to be heard. The employment of spiritual weapons was their sphere. This he said with regard to a body of men who were dealing with what he himself described as the reform of a great moral evil. It would be a bad day for this country when the clergy of all denominations were specially disfranchised from giving a hint to Parliament as to how it should act.

MR. A. J, BALFOUR: I never said that.

MR. THOMAS SHAW: The Prime Minister said they had no special title to give an opinion.

MR. BALFOUR: No special title—the title of all of us.

MR. THOMAS SHAW thought the clergy, as such, had a special title in regard to a moral evil. He did not wish in the slightest degree to over-strain the view presented by the right hon, Gentleman. But the view which he himself presented was that there were two forces with which the Prime Minister had been confronted; one apparently was legitimate, the other he considered, as proceeding from the churches, had no special title to be heard in the region of secular methods affecting legislation. What were the secular methods that had been used in other quarters? A brewer at a recent meeting said to his fellow-brewers: "In your just resentment and revenge even the most powerful Government of modern times may feel your hand heavy upon them." That was a secular method. This kind of language the Government would attend to. "All Governments depend on votes, and if the Government wants the votes of licence-holders they must promise us the protection we demand." There was a good deal of secular method about that; it was the method which this Government alone understood—the bludgeon in the hands of a powerful and overmastering interest like the liquor trade. The liquor trade had not been idle in recent weeks. It had tried public meetings, but with all the engineering that had taken place it could not have them. It had made most elaborate arrangements for public meetings being crowded with the supporters of the trade before anybody else could get in, but no public meetings that one had heard of had been held. This was what was now announced by circular dated April this year—

> "The entire work of many years of organisation, and the whole future of the trade, will depend upon a few weeks activity at the present time."

That was a secular method. They now saw exactly the force that had come upon the Prime Minister. He had adjured the Bishops, but he succumbed to the secular methods of the brewers. Why was there to be no compromise even on the time limit? The trade had intimated that they would not have it. Two interests were concerned in this matter, and during these discussions too much attention had been paid to the one and too little to the other. There was the interest of the trade, strong, powerful, clever, well organised, and full of money, and this interest had been well attended to; the Government were on its side. The other interest was that of millions of people who, by ignorance, by poverty, and misfortune, were beset by the temptations of the greatest social curse in our midst. It was poltroonery on the part of the Government of this country to do nothing to protect them against this powerful interest. By accepting the Amendment Parliament would give the power of closing the chapter of temptation in localities, but the Government protected the strong and oppressed the weak by resisting any idea of compromise.

He would now venture very humbly to express his difference from certain opinions which had been delivered in the course of the debate as to the finality of this measure. He quite agreed with the Colonial Secretary that the omnipotence of Parliament could not be impaired, and with regard to the obstacle to reform he was not sure that he quite agreed with his right hon. friend the Member for Berwick, who said the Bill closed the door against reform; the resistance to this time limit seemed to him to open a door. If they were by their constitutional position confronted by a steadily hostile attitude in another place, if the Liberal Party were prevented from repealing the Act, then they would have to look around and find some other way of checkmating this powerful interest, and they would do it by imposing a heavy charge on this monopoly. With a time limit Parliament would not attack the question with the same force, but if there was to be no compromise, if perpetuity was to be maintained, if from the passing of this Bill there was to be a perpetual right in the licensee as against the public, then the public would call for the prompt and effective imposition of such a tax as would restore to the public their right. The triumph of no compromise would be short-lived. It might provoke at a very early time the imposition of such a tax as would restore to the State its mastery over the trade. The trade was powerful beyond all computation. He had seen passages in which it declared that it put this Government in, and that if the Government did not do its behests it would chuck this Government out. That was the language not of Britons but of Tammany. Tammany knew the men it had to deal with. According to its own view the trade held the Government in the hollow of its hand. In this time limit discussion the House had reached a point when those who were pleading for it asked that a restoration should be effected which would give Parliament mastery over a trade whose methods, unabashed and openly avowed, were methods of public political corruption.

MR. GEORGE WHITE (Norfolk, N.W.) said he was sure that the Committee would sympathise with him in the position in which he found himself after the very eloquent speech of the hon. and learned Gentleman who had just sat down. He would not delay the House at any very great length, because the hon. and learned Gentleman had put before the Committee, in language which he could not be expected to imitate, many of the things he desired to say. He felt that they had had far too much discussion upon the mere trivialities of this question, but the hon. and learned Gentleman had placed the subject on a higher level than before, and he would be only too glad if the discussion could be kept on that level until the end of the debate. After all, this was a great moral question, and he, for one, felt that the position was such that the plain speaking in which the hon. and learned Gentleman had indulged was the kind of speaking which the subject merited from the Opposition. Some hon. Members opposite might think that the country looked with complacency at the way in which the question had been brought forward; but he, for one, felt that the atmosphere outside was very different from the atmosphere inside the House. Some of them on that side of the House had had a good deal of opportunity of knowing what the public feeling was in regard to this matter, and he ventured to say that there had been no question before the public for many years on which there had been such a determined expression of opinion on one side only in regard to the issues involved in this struggle. There had been no records of any public meeting throughout the length and breadth of the land, expressing an opinion in favour of the Bill now before the House, while hon. Members on both sides of the House had had plenty of opportunities of learning the opinion of large assemblies of their fellow citizens, and also of a great number of those who had to do with the moral welfare of the country. The sooner they got rid of the sham idea that this Bill originated, as was pretended, on the other side, with the desire to limit the number of public-houses, the sooner they should assume the attitude of honest men in face of the public at large.

The claim of the Colonial Secretary, that the origin of the Bill was a desire to aid the magistrates to reduce the number of public-houses was one of the most extraordinary that could be submitted to an intelligent assembly. They knew perfectly well that it was meant to prevent the magistrates reducing the number of public-houses to a larger extent than at present. After having refused to receive a deputation of those interested in temperance reform, the Prime Minister received a deputation of those interested in a trade which was inimical to the best interests of the nation, whether considered from a commercial, social, or moral point of view. After the speech made by the Prime Minister to that deputation of the trade, to pretend that this Bill was a measure of temperance reform was a great sham. Having been introduced at the call of the trade, it was not to be expected, on the face of it, that it was calculated to promoted temperance. It was not too much to say that this movement was a grossly corrupt political act, and an act which was quite unworthy of the Prime Minister and of the Government of which he was the head. Strong opinions had been expressed about this trade by leading statesmen in the past generation or two, and he would read one of these from a leading statesman to which hon. Members on the other side of the House ought to pay some attention. The right hon. Gentleman said—

> "A priest-ridden nation is much to be pitied, but a publican-ridden nation is very much to be despised, and we look forward to the time when all political Parties shall proclaim war to the knife against this swollen social tyranny."

Those were the words of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham; and he thought he might venture to appeal to the Committee whether that tyranny was less swollen now than when those words were uttered. The extension of the tied-house system had swollen that social tyranny still more than a generation ago.

It had been assumed, but not proved, in the two interesting speeches delivered by the hon. Member for Exeter and the hon. Member for East Islington, that this Bill would reduce the number of licences by 25 per cent. in ten years. If such a reduction could be proved, then hon. Members interested in temperance reform would not oppose the Bill. But they could not accept such a statement because it was not backed up by figures. He would take his own city in order to show the position in which they were placed. The city of Norwich had more fully licensed houses than any other city in the kingdom irrespective of population, except Liverpool and Birmingham. Of course he excluded London. Leicester had just half the fully licensed houses which Norwich had, and yet it had three times the population, and he would like to know how long it would take under the Bill to bring the position of Norwich to that of Leicester. He could give example after example to show that the number of licences which had been reduced from one cause or another in many cities and towns was larger, in his judgment, under the present system than this Bill could effect. It had been assumed that the maximum sum which could be raised under the Bill would be raised—an assumption of which he had great doubts. In various parts of the country there were magistrates who would be only too glad to put the Bill into action, but in other parts of the country where they would not. Even if the maximum sum were raised, it seemed to him that the process of reduction would be so extremely slow that it could not at all answer the expectation of those Gentlemen opposite who had argued that a great reduction in the number of public-houses would be effected.

They were told that one advantage of the Bill would be that it would give fixity of tenure, and that the tenants of the houses would be a much more respectable body of men than at present. As a licensing magistrate he could assure the Committee that they did their duty and only granted licences to respectable men, and he did not know how they were going to improve their quality. Fixity of tenure to a publican was not dependent on an Act of Parliament, but on an agreement between him and the brewer. It was true that the publican was supposed to enter into that agreement as a voluntary agent, but they knew that he was anything but that. If they were to deal with fixity of tenure, they must deal with the tied-house system. He did not know to whom the hon. Member for Berkshire was referring when he said that many hard things had been spoken about the publicans in the debate. He had not heard anything against them. It was not the individual they complained of, but the trade and the outcome of the trade; and in this respect the publican might fairly exclaim "Save me from my friends." He could not see how the publican was to get much advantage from the Bill. If he believed that there was any probability of a large reduction of licences from the operation of this measure he would not be so strong in opposition to it as he found himself at the present moment. While he admitted that the bringing in of the principle of compensation was dangerous, if he felt that the Bill was in any sense a temperance reform measure, he would give it support instead of opposition. The country was ripe for temperance reform and the Government were throwing away a golden opportunity of dealing with this great social question. It could not be supposed that the trade wished to reduce drinking, because the greatest profits of the business were made from excessive drinking, and therefore it would be contrary to human nature to suppose that they would be in favour of a Bill which would largely reduce those profits. He hoped this question would not be considered as one of £ s. d., but that something would be done to limit instead of increasing temptations for the people; and it was because he felt that this Bill would do nothing of the kind that he supported the Amendment.

MR. ALEXANDER CROSS (Glasgow, Camlachie) said he would not venture to say a word to the hon. Members on the other side of the House, but he would ask hon. Gentlemen beside him to consider that in the vote they gave that night they would decide between the interests of the public and the publican. It was generally admitted that a situation had arisen under which some allowance for compensation ought to be given to publicans who were deprived of their licences. He was himself in favour of some time limit by which after a certain period the public would be able to assert a right to its own, and he felt that those who voted with the Government on this question would be voting to deprive the public of their interest in this property of licences. He wished to submit this point—was it wise to hand over an important trade like the liquor trade to a monopoly, and to part for ever with the right to deal with it in the public interest? The present system involved tied houses, monopolies, and the suppression of small interests; and it was not for this Parliament to pass over every interest in the trade to any body of men whatever. Up till now, the whole licensing business had been in the hands of the local justices of the peace and quarter sessions, both of which were non-elective bodies, and irresponsible to the people. The question was, how long the country would allow the conduct of the liquor trade to be in the hands of non-elected bodies. If this Bill passed, the trade would be placed in the hands of the non-elected quarter sessions, and he did not think that that would be safe. He did not believe any temporary advantage to be obtained from a small reduction of licences could be compared with the injury that would be inflicted by handing over this great trade to a non-elective body to the betrayal of the public interest. He did not know personally how the public in England regarded this subject; but he had gone up and down Scotland to find out how this measure was viewed by the people in the North. The result of his inquiry was, that the feeling prevailed that a more unpopular measure than this had never been brought forward by a Government. The Scottish people believed it to be unjust in conception and wrong in principle. His hon. friend had referred to the opinion of the Church Courts in Scotland. He had had the privilege of testing that opinion, and he ventured to say that the Prime Minister had strained the loyalty of many men who had been his devoted followers by the introduction of this measure, and it would lead to serious and great difficulty to some of those who supported it when they went down for re-election at the dissolution, whenever it came. He heard no part of the speech of the hon. and learned Member for the Border Burghs with more satisfaction than his declaration that it would be necessary for the nation to resume its right over its property, and that the Government soon to be in power would adopt such an addition to the tax on licences as to have the effect of sweeping away the improper premium given to the trade which this Bill granted. If he was spared to that time, he would give such a measure his hearty support.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: My hon. friend who has just sat down told the House that in his opinion this was the most unpopular measure ever proposed by any Government. I do not know whether he is right or wrong. I do not pretend to have his insight into the movements and currents of temporary popular opinion; but, at all events, I should have thought he would have realised that that accusation entirely disposed of the speech which he appeared so much to admire—the speech of the hon. and learned Member for the Border Burghs, who explained that it was a purely electioneering measure. I do not know which of those twin brethren, who agree apparently absolutely on this question, is right, but it is quite clear that the accusation brought so freely against us that we have been animated by no motive more dignified or more worthy than the lowest form of electioneering tactics is hardly consistent with the other accusation that we have brought forward the most unpopular Bill which any Government has succeeded in fathering. I do not mean to waste the time of the House at this late hour, at the end of a second day's debate on a single Amendment, by dealing with the personal aspect of the question at any length. But as so large a number of speakers have professed to judge the Bill as a whole, and this Amendment in particular, from what they were pleased to term the origin of the Bill in a speech which I made to a deputation representing the licensed victuallers, perhaps I may be allowed to say one or two words on that subject. It is quite true that that deputation waited upon me. It is quite true that I made a speech on the subject, in which I see nothing to regret, to qualify, or withdraw. Hon. Gentlemen appear to suppose that it was that deputation which first brought into existence the idea that the publican was, even as other citizens in this country, a man who deserved compensation when he was deprived of property. [Cries of "It is no property."] I will come to the question of property in a moment, but my view is that he does possess property, and that view was not invented and did not begin with the deputation to which reference has been made. It has always, so far as I know, been the view of the Unionist Party that true temperance reform was only possible if you recognised that the trade should not be deprived of that which equity demanded should be given to them, that temperance reform could only be carried out on those lines; and I think we may claim to be the true temperance reformers. Hon. Members laugh. I thought it probable that that would be contested; but now I will make a proposition which will not be contested, which is that hon. Gentlemen opposite have never done a single thing for temperance reform except to make platform speeches outside this House, and have resisted every reasonable attempt to carry out temperance reform within it. They have been violent critics but barren critics, a union of qualities not unknown in other departments of human activity.

Now I do not wish to say more about the personal aspect of the matter than that. I have always been in favour, in dealing with the question of licences, of giving adequate, equitable compensation to the licence-holder. I have always counted myself—I know I am not counted by hon. Gentleman opposite—I have always counted myself among temperance reformers; but I honestly confess that when I hear speakers of the authority and ability of the Member for Carnarvon Boroughs and the hon. and learned Gentleman who spoke recently—the one with considerable wit and the other with considerable solemnity—accuse me individually and the Government to which I belong collectively of being animated by nothing but the smallest, pettiest, and meanest motives in bringing forward this Bill, I do not resent the charge even from such high authorities as themselves, but I confess I do form a somewhat lower opinion of the general motives which actuate hon. Members opposite. They themselves will not, I presume, suggest that they never consider electioneering motives in some of the speeches, some of the representations or misrepresentations which they make of their opponents' actions. I do not wish to bring it specially before their notice on the present occasion, but I, at all events—though I doubt not that their motives, like the motives of others, may be mixed—I have never doubted that in their speeches upon the temperance question they have a strain of genuine, earnest desire for the improvement of their countrymen in the matter of temperance. Well, I give them credit for that. If they refuse credit to me for similar motives I make no complaint, but I do think it casts rather a lurid light on the manner in which they consider the great political questions which have been and may be handed over to their charge, and I think that little is to be gained either inside or outside this House by this persistent and, as I think, utterly contemptible method of controversy, of finding it absolutely inconceivable that among the motives, the mixed motives, the bad motives, if you please, of your political opponents there may be occasionally some small, faint glimmer of conscientious convictions.

I will not pursue the personal topic any further, and as I desire to give the right hon. Gentleman who, I presume, will reply to me full opportunity for the exercise of his great dialectical gifts I do not propose to survey in any detail the arguments that have been advanced in the course of this debate. But I may perhaps be allowed to point out one or two singular fallacies into which even the hon. and learned Member for the Border Burghs tumbled accidentally in the course of his speech. He actually advanced the argument, which has been advanced by a good many other Gentlemen opposite but which I did not expect from him, that you are to estimate the justice or injustice of the number of years for which the time limit was to be fixed by the number of years purchase of the business with which you are dealing. He said the Amendment to the Amendment gave a time limit of fourteen years. He quoted an hon. and learned friend behind me, who said that the average number of years purchase given to the trade in arbitration cases was ten. "Therefore," said the hon. and learned Member for the Border Burghs, "if only ten years purchase is given, what reason have you to complain of a fourteen years limit to the Bill?" I never heard such an argument. It implies a profound confusion of ideas which I cannot think prevails generally on the Benches opposite. But even if the property of a man was worth only two years purchase, it would not console him to say that at the end of fourteen years you would take it away from him altogether without any compensation. To say to a man whose business is worth only two years purchase, "I will allow you to enjoy your property for only fourteen years, and you must take that enjoyment, not only as sufficient payment, but as seven times more payment," involves a confusion of ideas which even the hon. and learned Gentleman, when he comes to think over it, must be bound to admit.

It has also been frequently stated by hon. Gentlemen opposite that because we do not insert a time limit in this Bill we give a freehold value to the holder of a publican's licence. That, again, is a profound confusion between the length of time during which compensation may be asked for and the amount of compensation which may be given. You can always, by varying the amount of the compensation, deal with an everlasting tenure, which is a freehold tenure, or with a short tenure. The Committee will see this in the separate treatment of beerhouse licences from ordinary public-house licences under the Bill. A beerhouse licence may be, in sufficiently intelligible language, described as a freehold. Of course, value for value, the owners of beerhouse licences will get a larger number of years purchase than the owners of ordinary publicans' licences. [HON. MEMBERS: No!] But they will, and they do. We are not now dealing with hypothetical values. We are dealing with actual values upon which the owners are rated. There is no doubt that the fact that publicans have not the same kind of security in their licences as the owners of beerhouses have will, of course, make their compensation much less; but that is no reason why you should bring the process of giving that compensation more rapidly to an end. As I have said, the compensation given to them will be less, value for value, than that given for a freehold tenure. But that does not carry with it the inference that while a freehold should have no time limit you may put a time limit on the short tenure. We do not desire to endow, and I believe we do not endow, any trade or portion of a trade by this Bill. What we endeavour to do is not to endow the publicans with something which they have not got, but to give them security in something that they have got, and what they have got is something less than a freehold, which is not, on that account, undeserving of the name of property. I am not going to argue with the lawyers opposite, who seems satisfied with the way the law now stands, under which a man, in the same breath, is said to possess something that may be rated and taxed but something that is not property. They are quite happy over that, and I do not wish to disturb their complacency. But I will venture respectfully to say that a thing which can be valued, a thing which can be bought, a thing which can be sold, a thing which can be taxed, and a thing which can be rated is not wholly unworthy of the name of property.

Well, if we do not endow this trade, if we give it nothing which it is not barely entitled to, if we do not, as I am sure we do not, give it freehold tenure, what are the objections which have been raised to our scheme? One thing which it does is never referred to by these Gentlemen who denounce it as the most wicked, most unpopular, and most foolish attempt to deal with the temperance question ever known—not one of them has ever referred to the beerhouse question, with which this Bill attempts to deal. They are going to reject that. They have never attempted to deal with the monopoly question; this Bill, as far as regards future licences, does attempt to deal with it. I think that the language of Clause 4 may be still further improved in that direction. But the intention of the framers of the Bill was that future licences should not constitute a monopoly, and should be subject to those experiments which hon. Gentlemen opposite are so anxious to see tried seven or fourteen years hence, but are so reluctant to see tried at the present moment. Then this Bill, which deals with beerhouses and which deals with the monopoly question, does most undoubtedly deal, and in a very large fashion, with the reduction of licences. There have been some Members who in their ardour of advocacy have denied that any large reduction would be made by this Bill. How you can expend £1,200,000 a year on the purchase of licences without materially reducing them I do not know. We live in an age of large figures, but I really do not know how you are going to achieve that result. If I may without offence distinguish the Party opposition to this Bill from the more genuine elements of opposition which I have no doubt exist in the breast of Gentlemen opposite and in the breasts of some of my hon. friends on this side, I believe their anxiety about the time limit, in so far as it arises from those motives, is due to a fear lest we are shutting the door on any kind of temperance reform in the future other than the present Bill. I believe the more moderate and reasonable opponents of the Bill are prepared to say that this Bill is good as far as it goes, that it will reduce licences, that it will deal with the beerhouses and with the future monopoly question, but that those benefits, great though they may be, are too dearly purchased if they are purchased at the cost of preventing this House at any future period from touching the question of temperance again. Well, I do not know whether if even that statement were true I should agree with the conclusions drawn from it; but I can assure my hon. friends, and those on the other side of the House who feel as they do, that this is a pure illusion. There is nothing I know in this Bill which is going to stand in the way of any future reform.

May I recall the Committee for a moment to arguments addressed to it by the right hon. Member for Aberdeen when it was much thinner, at about six o'clock? The right hon. Gentleman made a speech in favour of the Amendment, and he said—

> "Why should not you have a time limit; how would it hurt the trade, when you remember that at the end of fourteen years by the operation of this Bill you will have greatly diminished licences, and that the houses which remain will presumably be the houses that are necessary, and the houses whose security of tenure from that fact is so great that they will without difficulty be able to insure themselves? Why should you under those circumstances have this general system of compulsory insurance proposed by the Bill?"

And then the right hon. Gentleman, having finished that section of his argument, apparently forgot it, and went on at a later stage of his speech to say that at the end of fourteen years we ought to be able to try every kind of experiment, local veto, and all the other schemes, possible and impossible, which have been from time to time suggested. Do let the Committee consider those arguments. The houses that are left after fourteen years are to be so necessary and so useful to the community that it would be easy for them to insure themselves, because of the difficulty of dispossessing them, and at the same time they are to be the subject of general experiment, they are to be abolished at a sweep by the advocates of local veto, they are to be municipalised, or they are to be conducted without profit, in accordance with the principles of a third scheme. And all this with reference to houses which, if they are to be subject to this kind of confiscation, would not be able to insure themselves at all. Obviously no insurance office not managed by lunatics would insure public-houses which the vote of the locality could abolish without compensation that day week. I mention that casually in order to bring me up to this point. Parliament is omnipotent now and it will be omnipotent in the future with regard to this and every other trade. If Parliament desires to try any new experiments justly, it can do so if it chooses to pay the compensation justly required. If it desires to do so unjustly, it can carry out these experiments without paying any compensation. There is nothing in this Bill which prevents just or unjust treatment of the trade by some future Parliament, and there is no way by which any Parliament can bind its successors. For my part, I should resist to the utmost anything in the nature of unjust treatment of the trade, and so far as I understand some of the schemes advocated here and there by hon. Gentlemen opposite, I should resist them even though they included adequate compensation to the trade, because I believe they are absurd, but whether they are absurd or whether they are not, the liberty of future Parliament is in no way bound.

I hope every Parliament will be bound by the laws of equity and will not try in future experiments at the cost of any trade in this country without paying adequate compensation to those who carry on that trade. That liberty Parliament has; the liberty of injustice it also has; both remain untouched and undiminished by anything the House may do in connection with this Bill. May I ask my hon. friends on this side and hon. Gentlemen, if there are any, on the other side, whose votes still hang in the balance, whether they seriously think that it would be wise in the interests of temperance to destroy a Bill which is going in the immediate future to do a great good, because, possibly, fourteen years hence Gentlemen opposite who are not agreed upon any of these alternative schemes may perhaps come to some agreement upon an unknown and unforeseen plan not now before us? If we brought in a Bill for municipalisation would they have supported it? They would not. If we had brought in a Bill with compensation for the working of the liquor traffic without profit, would they have supported it? Well I cannot imagine it; but if we had brought in a local veto Bill many of them might have supported it; but they are absolutely divided amongst themselves as to any alternative to the present system. Surely it would be folly on our part, when we have for the first time within our reach, and almost within our grasp, something which will, without inflicting injustice upon any man, woman, or child in the community, immediately effect a great and beneficent change in our licensing laws and which will not fetter the discretion of future Parliaments in anything they may desire to do in the same direction—surely we should be almost criminal in our negligence if we were to add yet another to the many failures which Parliament has already made in dealing with this question. Let the barren critics of whom I spoke earlier in my speech make what clamour they like on the present occasion; they have been too powerful in the past; they have found too great an echo for their criticisms and their opposition; but at all events let us insist, in the course of this Parliament, if we are to carry into effect that which is a practical and effective addition to the temperance forces of this country, and which is, I believe, not less in favour of temperance, not less in favour of higher morality, in that great branch of national morals because it also endeavours, I hope not imperfectly, to follow the dictates of eternal justice.

*MR. SLACK (Hertfordshire, St. Albans) said he had considerable diffidence in following the eloquent speech of the Prime Minister. The right hon. Gentleman asked whether, in the interests of temperance, it would be wise to destroy this Bill. He would answer that question—"A thousand times, yes." He regarded the Bill as the most serious attack on temperance and sobriety made in this House in our time. He had listened with great interest to the speech of the Prime Minister, and contrasted it with the speech delivered by the right hon. Gentleman on the Second Reading, because some of the utterances in the latter speech seemed to him to be unworthy of the right hon. Gentleman, his history, and the great position he occupied. The speech the right hon. Gentleman had just delivered seemed to him to be singularly inconsistent with the position he assumed yesterday, when he was so strenuous in resisting a clear issue being submitted to the House, namely, the application of a time limit to compensation under the Bill. The Prime Minister referred to himself and his Party as temperance reformers. That seemed to him to be the most amazing and—he would use the word in no objectionable sense—the most ridiculous proposal that could possibly be put before the House. The right hon. Gentleman asked what efforts had been made by the Liberal Party to deal with a traffic described by a great Conservative statesman as "devilish and destructive." Such efforts had constantly been made, but they had been as constantly checkmated by hon. Members on the other side. The proposals of the Liberal Party had been on lines diametrically opposite to those embodied in the present Bill, because the Party believed in extending, and not limiting, local control over the liquor traffic. This Bill not only crippled and confined local control, but transferred it from the local justices who knew the local circumstances to the Court of quarter sessions at a distance. In the view of thoughtful, serious, and moderate men, no more unpopular measure had ever been introduced into the House of Commons by a responsible Government, but having regard to the threats which had been uttered by the powerful brewery interest he was not surprised the Government had brought it in. The existence of 100,000 brewery shareholders in the country was a factor to be taken into account when a general election was approaching; those votes were cast solidly for the Unionist Party at the last election, and the Government were naturally anxious to secure a continuance of that support. As to the Prime Minister's contention that a licence was property because it was something which had a market value and could be taxed, patents and copyrights had a market value and could be taxed, but they nevertheless were subject to a time limit, being temporary monopolies granted for only a limited number of years.

He objected to the Bill root and branch; it fundamentally altered and revolutionised our licensing system; and there had been no mandate or demand of any kind for the injurious changes it proposed. The absence of a time limit was a cardinal defect. The compensation proposal was not a terminable arrangement; it established a permanent claim wherever a licence was proved to be unnecessary; it assumed what the law denied that a licence granted for only one year was entitled to a perpetual renewal, and conceded a value based upon that assumption. If the Government had said, "It has become customary to renew these licences, and so an expectation has arisen that they will be renewed, and accordingly capital has been invested in them, therefore we should allow a compassionate consideration;" then they would have secured a large public support for this Bill. But the Bill ignored the legal *status* of the licence, and created a value of an estate in the licence which it did not legally possess. The State had created a monopoly and given it to an individual. The brewer had acquired this at a fancy and swollen price, and now the State was asked to buy it back at a price fixed by its present owner. The licence was originally created to supply a public need, and the Bill provided that where a licence was taken away because it was no longer needed compensation should be paid. That was a bad principle, because if granted on the ground that the public required it—and taken away on the ground that the public did not require it—that was the best possible reason why no compensation whatever should be paid, or if paid at all, only for a limited period. It was a case for a temporary remedy, one limited in the durations of its operation. The opponents of the Bill and those who advocated a time limit had no personal interest to serve. They supported it merely because they believed the Bill to be subversive of the moral and social progress of the country. The benefits claimed for the Bill by the Solicitor-General were illusory. In Birmingham last year 80 per cent. of the suppressed licences were those of pre-1869 beerhouses. By their full control over the full licences the justices were able to get rid of these beerhouses. The existing system was really begining to work well, because in 1903, 539 licences were finally refused and over 300 were surrendered, and that notwithstanding the fact that this legislation was threatened, and after the Prime Minister's lecture to the magistrates. As to the effect of the Bill, in Cumberland last year twenty-three licences were refused renewal; valuing the licences at £1,000 each, only eight could have been refused under the Bill. In Liverpool last year the number of licences was reduced by twenty-four. Under this Bill, putting their value at £2,000 each, there would have been a reduction of only eighteen. In Manchester forty licences were suppressed last year, while under this Bill the number could only have been fifteen. It was unseemly and improper that this Government should make such violent assaults on the Constitution of the country as they had done. He was convinced that they would never have been returned in 1900 if they had made known their intention to bring in Bills like this and others they had passed.

Much had been heard about "spoliation" and "confiscation," but there was no spoliation in taking from a man at the end of a year that which was given him for one year only, and property which did not exist could not be confiscated. The Bill would block the way for future reform. At present there was an absolute right in the justices to refuse a licence without compensation, but immediately the Bill was passed the trade might properly say there was confiscation if the licences were refused without compensation.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR rose in his place and claimed to move that the Question be now put.

Question proposed, "That the Question be now put."

MR. CROOKS (Woolwich) endeavoured to speak while the Question was being put from the Chair.

*THE CHAIRMAN: If the hon. Gentleman wishes to address me on a point of order he can do so during the division if he will sit covered.

MR. CROOKS (sitting covered) said—Mr. Chairman, I desire to know whether you intend to put the closure in operation when a Member is on his feet and speaking. I am anxious to address the House on this most important subject before the vote is taken. That I claim I am entitled to do, having regard to the fact that I represent a very large working-class constituency.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I have accepted the Motion for the closure. If that

Motion is rejected the hon. Member will have an opportunity of addressing the Committee.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 289; Noes, 205. (Division List No. 135.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Aird, Sir John
Allhusen, Augustus Hen. Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Austin, Sir John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A.J.(Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Boulnois, Edmund
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, Lt.-Col. H.F(Middlesex
Brassey, Albert
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brown, Sir Alex. H. (Shropsh.)
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J.(Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J.A(Worc.
Chamberlayne, T. (S'thampton
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Rt. Hon. Sir John C.R
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Davies, Sir H. D. (Chatham)
Denny, Colonel
Dewar, Sir T.R.(Tower Hamlets
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dimsdale, Rt. Hn. Sir Joseph C.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir F Dixon
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir JohnE
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants., W.
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J.(Manc'r
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, P. S. (Warwick, S.W.)
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gordon, Hn. J.E.(Elgin&Nairn)
Gordon, Maj. E. (T'r Hamlets)
Gore, Hn G.R.C. Ormsby-(Salop
Gore, Hon. S.F. Ormsby-(Linc.)
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E.W(B'rySEdm'nds
Greene, Henry D.(Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hain, Edward
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Marq of(L'nd'nderry
Hardy, L. (Kent, Ashford)
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th
Harris, Dr. Fredk. R. (Dulwich
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard(Hanley
Heath, James (Staffords., N.W.
Heaton, John Henniker
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford, W.
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Rt Hn. H(Somers't, E
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J.F.(Sheffield, Brightside
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Horner, Frederick William
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Howard, Jn.(Kent, Faversham
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Hutton, John (Yorks., N.R.)
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T.(Denbigh
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
Knowles, Sir Lees
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool
Lawson, J. Grant (Yorks., N.R.
Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham)
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hon. W. (Bristol, S.)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis(Edinburgh W.
M'Killop, James (Sterlingshire)
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcom, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell, W.J.H. (Dumfriessh.
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milvain, Thomas
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Moore, William
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald

Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Nolan, Col. J. P. (Galway, N.)
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Pease, Herb. Pike (Darlington)
Peel, Hn.Wm.Robert Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Pym, C. Guy
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, Hon M.W.(Stalybridge
Ritchie, Rt.Hn.Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Sir H. S. (Limehouse)
Sandys, Lt.-Col. Thos. Myles
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H.(Hertford,East)
Smith, James Parker(Lanarks.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Hn. Arthur Ormskirk)
Stanley, Edward Jas.(Somerset
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt.Hn.J.G(Oxf'd Univ.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt.Hn.Sir WilliamH.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt.-Col.A.C.E(Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G.E.(Notts.
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H.(Ashton und.Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W.H.(Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt.Hn. E.R.(Bath
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herb. Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Cawley, Frederick
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Cremer, William Randal
Crooks, William
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan)
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobbie, Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Elibank, Master of
Ellice,Capt E.C(SAndrw'sBghs
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Sir F. H. (Maidstone)
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Ffrench, Peter
Field, William
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, J. M. F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hammond, John
Harcourt, Lewis V.(Rossendale
Harcourt,RtHn SirW(Monm'th
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Hobhouse, C.E.H. (Bristol, E.)
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones, William(Carnarvonshire
Jordan, Jeremiah
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kilbride, Denis
Kitson, Sir James
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Jos. F. (Accrington)
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin

Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mellor, Rt. Hon. John William
Mitchell, Edw.(Fermanagh, N.)
Mooney, John J.
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Morley, Rt.Hn. John(Montrose
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Newnes, Sir George
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid.)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow,W.
O'Doherty, William
O'Malley, William
Palmer, Sir Chas. M. (Durham)
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Reid, Sir R. Threshie(Dumfries)
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roche, John
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L.(Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, Charles E.
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)
Seely, Maj.J.E.B.(Isle of Wight
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Slack, John Bamford
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, D. Alfred (Merthyr)
Thomas,J A(Glamorgan,Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, Jn. Cathcart (Orkney)
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Fred. W.(Norfolk, Mid.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Wilson, J.W.(Worcestersh.,N.)
Woodhouse,Sir J.T(Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. Robert Spencer.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said he desired to raise a point of order before the Question was put from the Chair. He submitted that this Amendment was contrary to the Standing Orders, and was, therefore, completely out of order. He was basing his point of order on the Chairman's own ruling. He submitted that the effect of the Amendment was to convert this Bill into a temporary Act. This must necessarily be the effect of this Amendment coming at the beginning, because it made the machinery temporary, it made the compensation temporary, and they were told that the two principles of the Bill were contained in the first clause. Therefore it converted the law into a temporary law, and was contrary to the Standing Orders. Standing Order No. 45 said—

> "The precise duration of every temporary law shall be expressed in a distinct clause at the end of the Bill."

If the words of the Amendment were inserted there was no provision in the Bill which could continue at the end of seven years.

*The CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member has overlooked Clause 4. The point which he has raised has been in my mind, and if Clause 4 were not in the Bill, then I think the hon. Member would be right. But with regard to new licences it has not been suggested that it is only a temporary Bill. After a two days debate it is rather late to raise this point. My attention had already been called by one or two Members to the point referred to, and I had pointed out to them the distinction I have just named.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said a two days debate did not make the Amendment in order if it was contrary to the Standing Orders. He submitted that if these words were inserted the whole Act would be a temporary one.

*The CHAIRMAN: I do not agree. The clauses to which they would refer would be Clauses 1, 2, and 3, and not Clause 4.

Mr. J. H. LEWIS (Flint Boroughs) asked whether in those circumstances it would be in order to limit the length of time during which the provision relating to new licences should apply.

*The CHAIRMAN: Probably, but I should like to see the hon. Member's Amendment when we reach the clause.

Question put accordingly, "That the word 'seven' stand part of the proposed Amendment."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 306; Noes, 187. (Division List, No. 136.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Aird, Sir John
Allhusen, Augustus Hen. Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Austin, Sir John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Boulnois, Edmund
Bowles, Lt.-Col. H. F (Middlesex
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brown, Sir Alex. H. (Shropsh.)
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A (Worc.
Chamberlayne, T. (S'thampton
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Chapman, Edward
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Rt. Hn. Sir John C. R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Cremer, William Randal
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Cullinan, J.
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, W. Bromley
Davies, Sir H. D. (Chatham)
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dewar, Sir T. R. (Tower Hamlets
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt. Hn. Sir Joseph C.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir F. Dixon
Dorington, Rt. Hn. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants., W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Ffrench, Peter
Field, William
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, P. S. (Warwick, S.W.)
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)
Gordon, Maj. Evans (T'r Hamlets
Gore, Hn G. R. C. Ormsby- (Salop
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby- (Linc.)
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E. W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Marq of (L'nd'nderry
Hammond, John
Hardy, L. (Kent, Ashford)
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th
Harris, Dr. Fredk. R. (Dulwich
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hayden, John Patrick
Heath, A. Howard (Hanley)
Heath, James (Staffords., N.W.
Heaton, John Henniker
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford, W.
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Howard, Jn. (Kent, Faversham
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Hutton, John (Yorks., N. R.)
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
Knowles, Sir Lees
Labouchere, Henry
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, J. Grant (Yorks., N.R.
Lee, A. H. (Hants.. Fareham)
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hon. W. (Bristol, S.)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis-Edinburgh, W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Milvain, Thomas
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hn. J. Scott (Hants.)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Mooney, John J.
Moore, William
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Morley, Rt. Hn. John (Montrose
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer

Moulton, John Fletcher
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Nolan, Col. J. P. (Galway, N.)
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norman, Henry
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow,W.
O'Doherty, William
O'Malley, William
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Pease, Herb. Pike (Darlington)
Peel, Hn.Wm.RobertWellesley
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pirie, Duncan V.
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Pym, C. Guy
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Reid, James (Greenock)
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, Hon.M.W.(Stalybridge
Ritchie, Rt.Hn.Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Roche, John
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rothschild, Hon.Lionel Walter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Sir H. S. (Limehouse
Sandys, Lt.-Col. Thos. Myles
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Seely, Maj.J.E.B.(Isleof Wight
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sheehy, David
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford,East)
Smith, James Parker(Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Hn.Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Edward Jas.(Somerset
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord(Lancs.)
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Wallace, Robert
Walrond, Rt.Hn.Sir WilliamH.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Wason, Jn. Cathcart (Orkney)
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt.-Col.A.C.E(Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G.E.(Notts.
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whiteley, H.(Ashton und.Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd,Sir W.H.(Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt.Hn. E.R.(Bath
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE AYES — Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herb. Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Bousfield, William Robert
Brigg, John
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Cawley, Frederick
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Crooks, William
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan)
Delany, William
Denny, Colonel
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobbie, Joseph
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Elibank, Master of
Ellice,Capt E.C(SAndrw'sBghs
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Sir F. H. (Maidstone)
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herb. John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hain, Edward
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt, Lewis V.(Rossendale
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Hobhouse, C.E.H.(Bristol, E.
Hobhouse,RtHn.H (Somers't,E
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jordan, Jeremiah
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kemp, Lieut.-Colonel George
Kennaway, Rt.Hn. Sir John H.
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T.(Denbigh
Kilbride, Denis
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Langley, Batty
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis

Leese, Sir Jos. F. (Accrington)
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Maxwell, W.J.H. (Dumfriessh.
Mellor, Rt. Hon. John William
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Mitchell, Edw. (Fermanagh, N.
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Murphy, John
Newnes, Sir George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid.)
Palmer, Sir Chas. M. (Durham)
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reddy, M.
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, Charles E.
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Slack, John Bamford
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Rt.Hn.C.R(Northants
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, D. Alfred (Merthyr)
Thomas,J.A.(Glamorgan,Gow'r
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Fred. W.(Norfolk,Mid.
Wilson, Henry J.(York, W.R.)
Wilson, J.W.(Worcestersh., N.)
Woodhouse, SirJ.T(Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Colonel Williams and Sir William Houldsworth.

Whereupon Mr. A. J. BALFOUR claimed, "That the Main Question be now put."

Question put accordingly, "That the words 'During the period of seven years after the passing of this Act' be there inserted."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 192; Noes, 290. (Division List No 137.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herb. Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Bousfield, William Robert
Brigg, John
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Cawley, Frederick
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Cremer, William Randal
Crooks, William
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan)
Delany, William
Denny, Colonel
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobbie, Joseph
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Elibank, Master of
Ellice,Capt E.C(SAndrw'sBghs
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Sir F. H. (Maidstone)
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Furness, Sir Christopher
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hain, Edward
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt, Lewis V.(Rossendale
Harcourt,RtHn.Sir W(Monm't
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Heath, A. Howard (Hanley)
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Hobhouse, C.E.H. (Bristol, E.)
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones, William(Carnarvonshire
Jordan, Jeremiah
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kemp, Lieut.-Colonel George
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kilbride, Denis
Kitson, Sir James
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)

Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F.(Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Maxwell, W.J.H.(Dumfriessh.)
Mellor, Rt. Hn. John William
Mitchell, Edw. (Fermanagh'N.
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Morley, Rt.Hn. John (Montrose
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Palmer, Sir Chas. M. (Durham)
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Pirie, Duncan V.
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reddy, M.
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John H (Denbighs.)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roche, John
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L.(Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, Charles E.
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)
Seely, Maj.J.E.B.(Isle of Wight
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Slack, John Bamford
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan,E.)
Thomas, D. Alfred (Merthyr)
Thomas, J.A(Glamorgan,Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, Jn. Cathcart (Orkney)
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Wilson, Fred.W.(Norfolk, Mid.
Wilson, Henry J.(York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Woodhouse,Sir J.T(Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. Robert Spencer.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Aird, Sir John
Allhusen, Augustus Hen. Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster,Rt.Hn.Hugh O
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt.Hn.Sir H.
Austin, Sir John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A.J.(Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Boland, John
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Boulnois, Edmund
Bowles, Lt.-Col.H.F(Middlesex
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brown, Sir Alex. H. (Shropsh.)
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt.Hn.J.(Birm.
Chamberlain,Rt Hn.J.A(Worc.
Chamberlayne, T. (S'thampton
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Rt.Hn.Sir John C. R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Cullinan, J.
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Davies, Sir H.D. (Chatham)
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dewar, Sir T. R. (Tr. Haml'ts)
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dimsdale, Rt.Hn.Sir Joseph C.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir F Dixon
Dorington, Rt. Hn. Sir John E
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Dyke, Rt.Hn.Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants., W.
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fergusson,Rt.Hn.Sir J.(Manc'r
Ffrench, Peter
Field, William
Finch, Rt Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, P. S. (Warwick, S.W.)
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gordon, Hn.J.E.(Elgin & Nairn)
Gordon, Maj. E. (T'r Hamlets)
Gore, HnG.R.C.Ormsby-(Salop
Gore, Hon. S.F.Ormsby-(Linc.)
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene,SirE.W(B'rySEdm'nds
Greene, Henry D.(Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.)
Grenfell, William Henry

Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton,Marq of(L'nd'nderry
Hammond, John
Hardy, L. (Kent, Ashford)
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th
Harris, Dr. Fredk. R. (Dulwich
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hayden, John Patrick
Heath, James (Staffords., N.W.
Heaton, John Henniker
Henderson, Sir A.(Stafford, W.
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Horner, Frederick William
Howard, Jn.(Kent, Faversham
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Hutton, John (Yorks., N.R.)
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W.(Salop.
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
Knowles, Sir Lees
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, J. Grant (Yorks., N.R.
Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham)
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hon. W. (Bristol, S.)
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver,Sir Lewis(EdinburghW.
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milvain, Thomas
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hn. J. Scott (Hants.)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Mooney, John J.
Moore, William
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Nolan, Col.John P.(Galway,N.)
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid.)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow,W.
O'Doherty, William
O'Malley, William
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Pease, Herb. Pike (Darlington)
Peel, Hn.Wm.Robert Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Pym, C. Guy
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, Hon. M.W.(Stalybridge
Ritchie, Rt. Hn.Chas.Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rothschild, Hon.Lionel Walter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Sir H. S. (Limehouse)
Sandys, Lt.-Col. Thos. Myles
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H.(Hertford,East)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Edward Jas.(Somerset
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt.Hn.Sir WilliamH.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt.-Col.A.C.E(Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. E.(Notts
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und.Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Wilson-Todd, Sir W.H.(Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt.Hn. E.R.(Bath
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland - Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

And, it being after Midnight, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again to-morrow.

———

DEAN FOREST BILL.

Read a second time, and committed to a Select Committee of Three Members, to be nominated by the Committee of Selection.

Ordered, That all Petitions against the Bill presented seven clear days before the meeting of the Committee be referred to the Committee; that the Petitioners praying to be heard by themselves, their Counsel, or Agents be heard against the Bill, and Counsel heard in support of the Bill.

Ordered, That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records.—(*Mr. Victor Cavendish.*)

Adjourned at twenty minutes before One o'clock

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 8th June, 1904.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Chesterfield Gas and Water Board Bill [Lords]; London County Council (Money) Bill. As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

Ticehurst and District Water and Gas Bill [Lords]. Read a second time, and committed.

PETITIONS.

ALKALI, ETC., WORKS BILL.

Petition from Manchester and Salford, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Dunfermline, against; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Glasgow, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

HOUSE-LETTING (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Arbroath, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES, ETC., BILL.

Petition from Sheffield, against; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions against; from Altrincham; Walthamstow (three); Heywood; Exeter; Rodley; East Ham; Wimbledon; Seghill; Glasbury; Taunton (two); Bearpark; Henshaw; Willesden Green; Gravesend; Hereford; Tilehurst; Hoxton; Reading; Hebburn Colliery; Newcastle-upon-Tyne (nine); Egremont; North Shields; Blackhill; Fenny Stratford; Fleetwood; Awsworth; Fulham Dawes; W. Whatmough; New Herrington; Corris; South Tottenham; Finsbury Square; Alverstoke; Houghton le Spring; Sleaford; Preston; Tipton; King's Lynn; Whiteinch; Lower Wortley; Pentre; Hopwood; Bideford; Brixton; Esh; Hither Green; Meopham; Merthyr Tydfil; Tongham; Weston super Mare; Kingsbridge; Hull (three); Cardiff; Enfield Wash; Teignmouth; Lewes; South Shields; Cwmaman; Harry Haines and another (two); Luton (two); Swadlincote; Blaenrhondda (three); William Armistead; Bexley; John Sidney Smith and another; Waterhouses (three); Mytholmroyd; Coleford; Hamsteels; Broompark; Liverpool; Blackwood; Towyn; Alexandra R. Macfarline and others; Bury Saint Edmunds; Newport (Mon.) (five); Stilton; Whitechapel; Nelson (eleven; New Clee and Weelsby; Putney; Cheddar (four); Bourton on the Water; Bridgwater; Tow Law; Lancaster; Bedminster (two); Brigham; Isle of Thanet; Clayton West; Wesleyan Temperance Society; Cameley; Ipswich (two); Willington Quay; New Hirst; Southampton; Worthing; Shotts; Abercynon; Derby (six); Leicester; Leeds; Llanfiehill; Forest Fach; Old Buckenham; Balsall Heath; Shildon; Willesden and Harlesden; Atherstone; Old Street; Long Sutton; Highbridge; Stratford; Margate; Southport; Westbury on Trym; Heckmondwike; Hyde; South Bristol; Bellshill (two); Motherwell; Stirling; Kinross and West Fife; Dunfermline; Greenock(two); Pemberton; Sheffield (three); Husband Bosworth; Harden; Birmingham (nine); Kingston on Hull; Newton Mearns; Pentre; Tylorstown (two); Tynewyd; Edinburgh (three); Clapham; Haltwhistle; Bury (three); Burton Salmon; Meopham; Grayshott; Castleford; Petersfield; Salford; Sunninghill; Colne (four); Wolstanton; Newcastle under Lyme; Tinhead; Biggleswade (two); Cranfield; Stotfold; Aberdeen; Gorton; Acton; Bingley (three); Eldwick Beck; Kings Heath; High Wycombe (four); Wolstanton; Longton; Gilstead; Clacton on Sea; Eadington; Watford; Oxford; Apperley Bridge; Melksham; East Morton; Castlefields; Ferndale; Mardy; Ynyshir; Castleford; Canterbury; Knockholt; Chelsfield; Shoreham; Otford; Cudham; Ightham; Weald; Sevenoaks; Watchet and Williton; Ashton under Lyne (two); Mabe; Dalston; Barking; Enfield; Plymouth;

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

Forest Hill (two); Streatham Common; Halifax (two); Castleford; Leigh (five); Banbury; Loughborough; Wooburn and Bourne End; Wycombe; Bournemouth (four); Warmington; Wooler; Lowick; Spittal; Cotteridge; Caledonian Road; West Hartlepool (three); Dumfries and Maxwelltown; Annan; Manchester (four); Kingsteignton; Willenhall (three); Moffat; Redhill; Earlswood; Stoke Newington; Stalbridge; South Manchester (three); Micklethwaite; Parkstone; Frinton on Sea; Kilmarnock; Oldham; Brightlingsea; Farnworth; Aberavon; Chorlton on Medlock; Rusholme; Whalley Range; Cubitt Town; Rothesay; Hurst Brook; West Auckland; Gryffe Bank; Howden le Wear; Amble; Ashington; Wallington (Cambs.); Sidlesham; Lightcliffe; Earlestown (two); Golborne; Ashton in Makerfield; Marlow; Amersham; Winchmore Hill; Flackwell Heath; Lane End; Booker; Downley; Trowbridge (two); NorthWest Ham; Forest Gate; West Ham Lane; Warwick; Leamington; Bideford; Hartlepool; Manaton; Newton Abbot; Farnsfield; Middleton in Teesdale; Westminster; Southend on Sea; Bradford; Lowton; Glasgow (three); Greenheys (two); Haydon (four); Horsley on Tyne; Hanley; Chesterfield; Shirebrook; Glenboig; Bedminster; Newington Butts; Bolton Low Houses; Dacre; Penrith; Alva; Burrill; Steeten; Nantwich; Seaton Delaval; Blackley; Hooley Hill; Cotton Tree; Brimscombe; Clayton le Moors; Tarleton; Mapperley; Ayrshire; Draycott; Penruddock; Watermillock; Croydon (two); Oakridge; Clifton (three); Warlingham; Wisbech; Henderskelf; Walsall; Tulse Hill and West Norwood; Ganthorpe Terrington; Leek; Ogden; Buxton; Glossop; Kenley; Biddulph; Saint Pancras; Looe; Polperro; Salisbury; Heaton Moor; Moss Side; Old Trafford; Reddish; Levenshulme; Ipswich; Great Torrington; Bolton; Tavistock; Hilderstone; Blencowe; Hutton End; Plumpton; Johnley; Stechford; Clifton and Redland; Llanelly; Milnrow; Bethnal Green; Brandon; Hedley Hill Terrace; Clitheroe; Breconshire; Talgarth; Hay: Otley; Mildmay Park; Wolverhampton; Broughton; Cheetham (three); Harthill; Cheetham and Crumpsall; Tottenham; Fishponds; Bristol (two); Clayton le Moors; Norwood; Magor; Foulsyke; Midgeholme; Maentwrog; Crook; Cirencester; Carlisle; Redfield; Aston; Burnley: Chichester; Wellington; Reigate (three); Brighton; Lytham; and Folkingham; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions for alteration; from Braintree; Evesham; King's Heath; Bristol (two); and South Hackney; to lie upon the Table.

RE-VACCINATION BILL.

Petition from Trowbridge and Melksham, against; to lie upon the Table.

RE-VACCINATION BILL.

Petition from Salop, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

ROMAN CATHOLIC DISABILITIES REMOVAL BILL.

Petition from Glasgow, against; to lie upon the Table.

VALUATION BILL.

Petition from Eton, against; to lie upon the Table.

VALUATION BILL.

Petitions for alteration; from Burnley; and North Witchford; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

EAST INDIA (ARMY MEMORANDUM).

Return [presented 6th June] to be printed. [No. 200.]

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND).

Copy presented, of Report by George Andrew, esquire, one of His Majesty's Inspectors of Schools in Scotland on The Gemeindeschulen of Berlin and Charlottenburg [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

UNIVERSITIES OF OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE ACT, 1877 (OXFORD).

Copy presented, of Statute made by the Governing Body of Trinity College, Oxford, on 26th February, 1904, amending Statute VI. of the Statutes of the College [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 201.]

BOARD OF TRADE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD.

Copy presented, of Report of the Committee appointed to consider the Position and Duties of the Board of Trade and of the Local Government Board [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

SUPERANNUATION ACT, 1884.

Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 25th May, 1904, declaring that George Hockett, Artificer, Royal Small Arms Factory, Enfield, was appointed without a Civil Service Certificate, through inadvertence on the part of the Head of his Department [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

NAVIGATION AND SHIPPING.

Copy presented, of Annual Statement of Navigation and Shipping of the United Kingdom for the year 1903 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

HARWICH HARBOUR.

Copy presented, of Abstract of the Accounts of the Receipts and Expenditure of the Harwich Harbour Conservancy Board from the time of their incorporation down to and inclusive of the 31st March, 1904, etc. [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 202.]

AFRICA, No. 7 (1904).

Copy presented, of Further Correspondence respecting the Administration of the Independent State of the Congo (in continuation of Africa, No. 1, 1904) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

Inquiry into Charities (Administrative County of Durham). Further Return relative thereto [ordered 14th February, 1900; *Mr. Grant Lawson*]; to be printed. [No. 203.]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Naval Expenditure of France, Germany and Russia.

MR. RUNCIMAN (Dewsbury): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the Admiralty possess information for any years with regard to the total naval expenditure of France, Germany, or Russia, respectively, including expenditure out of capital, but excluding special war expenditure; for how many years they possess this information; and what has been the expenditure in these three countries in those years.

(*Answered by Mr. Pretyman.*) The information given in the following table is obtained from the published Annual Naval Estimates of the countries mentioned since the year 1889. It is not, however, known what proportion, if any, of this money has been provided out of capital. As the countries referred to have not been at war during these years these figures presumably do not include special war expenditure.

Naval Expenditure for France, Germany, and Russia for years 1889–1903, inclusive.

Year.	France.	Germany.	Russia.
	£	£	£
1889	—	2,615,205	4,078,422
1890	8,125,929	3,933,869	4,268,208
1891	9,280,000	4,210,436	4,946,170
1892	10,079,085	4,934,775	5,217,915
1893	10,215,576	3,989,845	5,484,215
1894	10,967,421	3,696,149	5,511,435
1895	10,724,042	4,083,966	5,713·573
1896	10,597,256	4,312,995	5,953,129
1897	10,431,033	5,876,275	8,290,217
1898	11,988,718	6,083,874	9,028,926
1899	13,796,037	6 672,788	10,606,500
1900	12,511,054	7,472,656	10,962,601
1901	13,107,701	9,624,956	11,659,766
1902	12,271,948	10,029,063	10,667,983
1903	12,538,861	10,252,014	12,349,567

Note.—In cases where the actual expenditure is not known the Estimates are given.

Medical Officer for Durness, Sutherland.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask the Secretary for Scotland whether, seeing that the position of parochial medical officer for the parish of Durness, Sutherland, fell vacant in 1898, will he state why Durness is omitted from the Parochial Medical Officers (Scotland) Return, 1903.

(*Answered by Mr. A. Graham Murray.*) I am informed by the Local Government Board for Scotland that the Return furnished to them by the Inspector of Poor in August, 1903, stated that the resident medical officership in the parish had never been vacant since 20th July, 1896. On now communicating with the Inspector of Poor the Board learn that the office was vacant in 1898, although the parish was never without a doctor, as the present medical officer was in the parish for weeks before his predecessor left.

Belgian and Swedish Officers of Turkish Gendarmerie.

Mr. MOON (St. Pancras, N.): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he will state under what diplomatic instrument and at what date certain Belgian and Swedish officers were appointed to posts connected with the *gendarmerie* of European Turkey; the numbers, duties, and respective ranks of such officers; and whether they have been or are likely to be detailed for work in the Adrianople vilayet.

(*Answered by Earl Percy.*) Two Swedish officers were appointed early in 1903, but their rank was not reported. Four Belgian officers, two lieutenant-colonels and two majors were appointed in August of the same year. The duties of these officers were described as those of inspection and reorganisation of the *gendarmerie*, but the two Swedes seem to have been employed at Uscub during the first few months in revising the regulations. Since the arrival of their Belgian colleagues they have been distributed between Uscub, Monastir, and Salonica.

European Officers of Macedonian Gendarmerie.

Mr. MOON: To ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he can give any further information as to the names and ranks of the European, and in particular of the English, officers of the Macedonian *gendarmerie*.

(*Answered by Earl Percy.*) The following British Officers are serving with the Macedonian *gendarmerie*:—

Major Anley.
Captain Bonham.
Lieutenant Stanley Clarke.
Lieutenant Smyly.
Lieutenant Hamilton.

The British Staff Officer attached to General de Giorgis is Colonel Fairholme.

The following are the Foreign Staff Officers:—

General Schostak . .	Russia.
Colonel Albera . . .	Italy.
Lieutenant-Colonel Vérand	France.
Lieutenant-Colonel Count de Salis	Austria.
Major von Alten . .	Germany.

The names of the Foreign Officers serving with the *gendarmerie* have not been communicated to His Majesty's Government.

Cost of Military Operations in Somaliland prior to October, 1902.

Mr. LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Milton): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he will state the total cost of military operations in Somaliland prior to the 1st October, 1902.

(*Answered by Earl Percy.*) The total cost of military operations against the Mullah from 1st April, 1900, to 30th September, 1902, amounts to £73,640.

Lists of Deaths supplied by Registrars to Weekly Newspapers.

Sir WALTER FOSTER (Derbyshire, Ilkeston): To ask the President of the Local Government Board, whether he is aware that the registrars of births and deaths have been accustomed to supply the weekly newspapers in country districts and small towns with the lists of deaths registered by them; whether this custom has been recently discontinued, and, if so, by whose orders; and whether he will communicate with the Registrar-General on the subject with a view to the continuance of a custom which gives information to the public.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) I am aware that in a certain number of cases lists of deaths have been supplied to the Press by registrars of births and deaths. This, however, has been done in contravention of the regulation on the subject. The Registrar-General has received complaints as to the publication of particulars which may lead to the identification of individuals, and he considers that any such publication tends to make persons unwilling to furnish information for registration purposes, and consequently to impair the reliability of vital statistics. He has recently issued a circular with a view to a strict observance of the regulation in future, and I am not prepared to interfere with his discretion in the matter.

South African War—Return Relating to Transports.

MR. BUCHANAN (Perthshire, E.). To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty when the Return relating to transports in the South African war, that was ordered on 5th August, 1903, will be in the hands of Members.

(*Answered by Mr. Pretyman.*) The Return is in the hands of the printers and it is hoped that it will shortly be in the possession of hon. Members. Owing to the complicated nature of the Return and the mass of details, it has been impracticable to finish the work earlier.

Estate of the late Mrs. Helen Blake.

MR. P. J. O'BRIEN (Tipperary, N.): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether, in view of the fact that a Mrs. Helen Blake (widow of General Robert Dudley Blake) died intestate at South Kensington, London, in 1876, leaving personal and other property to the amount of £140,000, which was taken possession of by the Crown failing direct issue, he can state whether the deceased has left any documents to show her parentage or birthplace; and, if so, where can such documents be seen, or any other documents that would indicate her intention as to the disposal of her property had she made a will.

(*Answered by Mr. Victor Cavendish.*) A document was found amongst the papers of the deceased which purported to give the name of her father, but the person named cannot be identified. There is nothing to show her place of birth. It is not the practice to produce documents of the character alluded to in the last part of the Question. No legal claim could be based upon them.

Suggested Sand Ride in Kensington Gardens.

LORD CECIL MANNERS (Leicestershire, Melton): To ask the hon. Member for Chorley, as representing the First Commissioner of Works, whether he will consider the advisability of increasing the space at the disposal of equestrians in the West End parks, by laying out a sand ride or rides in Kensington Gardens.

(*Answered by Lord Balcarres.*) This is a matter which has been engaging the attention of the First Commissioner, but he does not think that the proposal would command general approval, and the expenditure necessary to make a ride in Kensington Gardens would be very large. The First Commissioner is, therefore, not prepared to take any step in that direction at present.

Telephonic Arrangements in Tipperary.

MR. P. J. O'BRIEN: To ask the Postmaster-General if it is proposed to include Nenagh in the scheme for affording telephonic accommodation in Tipperary County; and, if not, will he consider the advisability of making arrangements for accommodating this, an assize town and the capital of North Tipperary.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) The nearest exchange to Nenagh on the Telephone Trunk Wire System is at Limerick. A trunk line between Limerick and Nenagh would be about twenty-eight miles in length. It does not seem probable that enough support for a telephone exchange could be obtained at Nenagh to justify this costly extension, except under a guarantee of revenue at the usual annual rate of £5 per mile of the trunk line. If, however, the hon. Member can furnish me with some definite information on this subject I shall be glad to make further inquiry.

Irish Banks and Inland Revenue.

MR. WILLIAM ABRAHAM (Cork County, N.E.): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer what are the circumstances under which the collection and remittance of Inland Revenue moneys paid by traders and others outside a radius of fifty miles from the city of Dublin, and which amount approximately to some £2,500,000 per annum, were placed in the hands of the Provincial Bank of Ireland;

what are the regulations under which the business is conducted; what approximately are the weekly balances held on this head by the Provincial Bank, and for how long are the same retained; whether, so far as this branch of revenue is concerned, there is any reason why the system which has for years prevailed in Scotland of each of the large Joint Stock Banks of that country being annually in turn placed in the position of remitters of revenue, should not be adopted in Ireland; whether, under the system now prevailing in Scotland, any difficulty has arisen in the transmission of revenue to the Exchequer; and, if not, whether there is any reason why the Irish Joint Stock Banks should not be dealt with on the same principle in relation to revenue moneys paid outside a radius of fifty miles from the city of Dublin.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) The arrangement with the Provincial Bank of Ireland for the collection and remittance of Inland Revenue from places more than fifty miles from Dublin was made in 1827. At that date the Bank of Ireland and the Provincial Bank were the only banks which had branches throughout Ireland. The terms of the arrangement with the Provincial Bank were revised in 1895. The revenue is paid daily into the various branches of the Provincial Bank and remitted by them to the Revenue Account at the Bank of Ireland four times a month. Previous to 1895 remittances were made only once in twelve days. A similar arrangement exists with English banks in the case of certain revenue receipts in England which cannot be remitted through the agents of the Bank of England. The object of this arrangement is to save the payment of commission to the banks for their services. The weekly balances with the Provincial Bank average about £50,000 and the money remains in the hands of the bank for one week from the expiration of the week in which it has been received. No difficulty has arisen in Scotland in the transmission of revenue, but the present banking arrangements in Ireland have worked satisfactorily and there would be no advantage, so far as the revenue is concerned, in having the Revenue Accounts kept by a number of banks either in annual rotation or otherwise. I am not, however, satisfied that the present arrangement is the best possible, and I propose to look further into the matter.

Licences for Brewing Home-made Beer.

MR. J. A. PEASE (Essex, Saffron Walden): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer what is the licence, if any, required by any person brewing home-made beer; whether any duty is levied on beer so brewed; and whether any such person may employ others to brew such beer upon his own or another person's premises when the beer brewed is required for domestic consumption.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain*). The particulars of the charges upon private brewers are as follows:—

	Annual licence duty charged. s. d.
A.—Exempt from Beer Duty.	
(1) The occupier of a house of an annual value not exceeding £8, who brews solely for his own domestic use	None.
(2) The occupier of a house of an annual value not exceeding £8, who brews for the consumption of farm labourers in his employ as well as for his own domestic use	4 0
(3) The occupier of a house of an annual value exceeding £8, but not exceeding £10, who brews for his own use or for the consumption of farm labourers in his employ . .	4 0
(4) The occupier of a house of an annual value exceeding £10, but not exceeding £15, who brews beer solely for his own domestic use	9 0
B.—Charged with Beer Duty.	
(1) The occupier of a house of an annual value exceeding £10, but not exceeding £15, who brews beer for the consumption of labourers in his employ, as well as for his own domestic use .	4 0
(2) The occupier of a house of an annual value exceeding £15, who brews for his own consumption or that of labourers in his employ.	4 0

A licensed private brewer may employ other persons to brew for him on his own premises, or, if he occupies a house of an annual value not exceeding £10 and is not liable to payment of beer duty, on premises gratuitously lent to him by a licensed brewer other than a brewer for sale.

Russian Influence in Tibet.

MR. SCHWANN (Manchester, N.): To ask the Secretary of State for India whether, looking to the declaration of Lord Lansdowne and the First Lord of the Treasury that they accept the assurances of Russia that there has been no Russian interference in Tibet, he will state whether the Government are in possession of any information, not contained in the Blue-book, implicating Dorjeff as the authoritative representative of Russia in Tibet.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) The statements to which the hon. Member refers represent the views of His Majesty's Government. It would be contrary to the public interest to add anything to them.

Irish National Education—Examination Papers under the New Programme.

MR. O'DOHERTY (Donegal, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that, on the adoption of the new programme by the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland, an undertaking was given that the examination papers in each year would be settled by a committee of three experts instead of one examiner as heretofore, and that, notwithstanding this undertaking, since the new programme came into force the papers have been settled by one examiner and not by a committee of three as promised; and, if so, will he take steps to have the undertaking thus given carried out by the Commissioners.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The examination papers for the Easter and July examinations of monitors, candidates for training, King's scholars, etc., are prepared by committees of senior and district inspectors specially selected as experts with the chief inspectors. In the case of subjects such as music, drawing, elementary science, etc., the head organiser of the special branch takes the place of the district inspector. The names of the senior and district inspectors or organiser appear on each question paper.

Fees due to Teachers for Evening Classes in County Donegal.

MR. O'DOHERTY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in view of the fact that the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland promised school teachers that the fees due to them for evening classes would be paid at the end of each session, he will explain why in certain schools in the county Donegal, although the session ended last January, the fees have not as yet been paid; and will he take steps to have the teachers paid their fees according to arrangement.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) There were five evening schools in county Donegal whose session ended with the 31st January. Of these, the capitation grant has been paid in three cases, and in the remaining two payment has been delayed owing to irregularities or non-observance of the requirements of the Commissioners' rules.

Neglect at Drogheda Mortuary.

MR. WILLIAM MOORE (Antrim, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if the attention of the Local Government Board has been called to the fact that a dead body was recently discovered in the morgue at Drogheda which had been left there for two months and upwards; and, if so, will he say who is the authority responsible for this neglect, and what steps will be taken to call the attention of such authority to their duty to prevent a recurrence of such a scandal

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The Local Government Board will communicate with the local sanitary authority in respect to this matter.

Work at Enfield Small Arms Factory.

MR. SHACKLETON (Lancashire, Clitheroe): To ask the Secretary of State for War what additions to buildings and plant have been made to the Royal Small Arms Factory, Enfield, since 1890; what number of new service rifles were turned out in 1890–1891; what number it is proposed to turn out this year and next; what number of workmen were employed in 1890–1891, and the average wage of the piece workers; what number of workmen are employed now excepting those preparing new plant; and what is the present average wage of the piece workers.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) The principal additions to buildings completed or approved are as follows:—New screwing shop, new shop for stock filers, accommodation for manufacture of new rifle, accommodation for conversion of rifles to new pattern, building for reserve of gunstocks, additional electric power. The total estimated cost of these is about £30,000. The principal additions to plant are in connection with the manufacture of the new short pattern rifle and the conversion of rifles to the new pattern, and may be estimated at about £40,000. The number of new service rifles turned out in 1890–91 was 92,127. The exact number of rifles which it is proposed to turn out this year and next cannot at present be stated. The number of workmen employed in 1890–91 was 3,206, and the piece workers earned on an average £1 13s. 7½d. weekly. The number of workmen now employed is 2,638. The work of preparing new plant is completed. The present average earnings of a piece worker may be set at £1 7s. 4½d. weekly. The difference in the average earnings for piece work now as compared with 1890–91 is due to short time.

Pay of General Officers Commanding-in-Chief.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE (Bristol, E.): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether the pay of the General Officers Commanding-in-Chief in the United Kingdom will be according to rank or whether a fixed salary will be attached to the office; and, if so, what that amount will be.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) I would prefer not to make a statement on this particular point until the whole question of the allocation and distribution of the commands has been settled, which I hope will be at an early date.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Loss of Submarine A 1.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the inquiry into the loss of Submarine A 1 has been concluded; and, if so, whether the Report will be laid upon the Table of the House.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. PRETYMAN, Suffolk, Woodbridge): It is not customary to publish the reports of Courts of Inqury, and no reason is seen for departing from the usual practice in this case.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: Is the hon. Gentleman aware that when the Navy Estimates were last before the House it was by general agreement arranged to postpone the discussion of this matter in consideration of the fact that an inquiry was being held, the results of which would be laid before the House.

MR. PRETYMAN: I remember no such pledge or suggestion as is referred to in the last part of the hon. Gentleman's remarks. It was certainly considered desirable that this discussion should be postponed until after the Court of Inquiry, because that would enable the representatives of the Admiralty here to reply with more certainty to any questions that might be raised; but that did not imply a promise of the kind suggested.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: Is not the House to have the information?

MR. PRETYMAN: It is the duty of the Admiralty to give whatever information is necessary.

Naval Gunnery.

MR. SEYMOUR ORMSBY-GORE (Lincolnshire, Gainsborough): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty when the results of the shooting in His Majesty's ships for the current year will be ascertained, and when such Return will be issued to Parliament.

MR. PRETYMAN: The Return will be prepared and printed as soon as possible after the receipt of the last Squadron

Return. I cannot hold out any hope that it will be in the hands of hon. Members at an earlier period of the year than the last Return, viz., February.

Malta Dockyard Extension Works.

MR. GALLOWAY (Manchester, S.W.): I beg to ask the Civil Lord to the Admiralty if he can state what progress is now being made with the extension of the dockyard at Malta; and if he can say when the work will be completed.

THE CIVIL LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. ARTHUR LEE, Hampshire, Fareham): I am glad to say that the contractor for this work is now pushing his operations in a more satisfactory manner, and considerably better progress is being made. It is hoped that the estimated date for completion, viz., 1907–8, will not need revision.

Army Organisation.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE (Bristol, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the Report of the Departmental Committee on the Organisation of the New Command Districts is yet complete; and, if so, whether it will be published as a Parliamentary Paper.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): The Report is not yet complete. It is not usual to publish Reports of purely Departmental Committees.

Sales of Government Stores in the Transvaal.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been directed to evidence given before the Chief Justice of the Transvaal as to the sale of Government stores by Colonel Morgan of the Army Service Corps; and what action he proposes to take thereon.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: My attention has been drawn to certain statements which have appeared in the public Press, and the General Officer Commanding in South Africa has been requested to forward a report as to their accuracy.

Compulsory Military Service.

SIR FREDERICK BANBURY (Camberwell, Peckham): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is prepared to consider the question of the revival of the Ballot Act for the Militia as an alternative to the proposals of the Duke of Norfolk's Commission.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The detailed proposals of the Commission are at present being carefully considered. There is no present intention of putting in force the Ballot Act for the Militia.

New Government Powder.

MR. SEYMOUR ORMSBY-GORE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War what are the results of the new Government powder as compared to those of cordite in the years 1901, 1902.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I am afraid that I cannot give my hon. friend any reply to his Question as all information on this matter is of a confidential nature.

Discharges of Workmen from Enfield Small Arms Factory.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the resolution passed by the District Council at Enfield, on the 1st June, setting forth the distress prevalent in the district in consequence of the slackness of work at the Royal Small Arms Factory, has been brought to his notice; and if he can say whether the £270,000, which appears in the Ordnance Factory Vote as wages for Enfield, is now being spent; and whether he will put a stop to the discharging of men with from twenty to thirty years service by allowing work which can be done at Enfield to go to private contractors.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Mr. BROMLEY DAVENPORT, Cheshire, Macclesfield): The resolution has been received and is under consideration. As regards the second paragraph, the figure mentioned was a maximum Estimate prepared at an early stage and before the orders for the year were finally settled. The rate of expenditure justified by the orders at present received from all sources is somewhat less. As regards the last paragraph, the factories have received their fair share of the total orders on the established principle that the resources of the trade as well as those of the Government factories must be utilised.

CAPTAIN NORTON: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the cost of rifles as produced by private contract is at least £1 more than the cost of those produced at Enfield, and can he not, in these circumstances, see his way to giving a larger proportion of the work to the Enfield factory, thereby putting an end to the distress which prevails in the district where rates are over 10s. in the £1.

MR. JESSE COLLINGS (Birmingham, Bordesley): Before the hon. Gentleman answers, may I ask whether, if the rates, taxes, and other trade charges—fixed charges—at Enfield were dealt with on a fair commercial basis, the cost of the rifle made at Enfield would not be proportionately larger.

MR. CROOKS (Woolwich): What is the value of the plant and material on which rates are paid at Enfield which are now standing idle?

MR. BROMLEY-DAVENPORT: The charges made against the cost of production do not include those mentioned by the right hon. Gentleman. If they were included, the cost of the rifle as made in the factory and as made by the trade would probably be about identical. The principle which governs the allocation of orders is this—that we must be prepared in time of peace so to regulate the production that it may be capable of rapid and very large expansion in the emergency of war. Therefore we give orders to the trade and orders to the factory. In answer to the hon. Member for Woolwich, I may say that, that being the accepted principle, it is inevitable that there must be considerable plant and machinery standing idle to be available in the emergency of war.

Labour Overseers in the Transvaal.

MR. MARKHAM (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the words "overseer in any capacity other than the management and control of labourers," found in Schedule I. of the Ordinance regulating the employment of Chinese labour in the Transvaal permits Asiatic overseers to direct the management of Asiatic labour in the actual operations of mining work, or whether the words "mine overseer" found in the same schedule covers this restriction and prevents Chinese performing such work.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. LYTTELTON, Warwich and Leamington): Section 9 (*a*) of the Ordinance, read in conjunction with the first schedule, seems to make it clear that Asiatics are not excluded from acting as overseers for the management and control of labourers in the actual operations of unskilled mining work.

MR. MARKHAM said he wished to point out that when the Ordinance was before the Legislative Council the words "mine overseer" were in the schedule. They had now been taken out. He wanted to know if there was not a distinct undertaking given in the Legislative Council that Chinese would not be entitled to act as overseers.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL (Yorkshire, Cleveland): As a matter of fact, will the labour of Chinese coolies be supervised by Chinese overseers and not by white men?

MR. LYTTELTON: Probably the actual gangers—the overseers for the control of unskilled miners—will be Chinese.

MR. MARKHAM: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that seven or eight different languages are spoken by natives in the South African mines——

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The Question on the Paper has been answered, and this is an argument as to what the consequence would be.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.): How will the right hon. Gentleman be able to make these new arrangements with regard to management agree with the promises made in the House with regard to the displacement of Europeans?

[No answer was returned.]

Agricultural Labour in the Transvaal.

MR. SEYMOUR ORMSBY-GORE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies what is the estimated number of natives in the Transvaal which will be liberated for agricultural purposes from the Witwatersrand mines by the importation of Chinese.

MR. LYTTELTON: I am not able to frame such an estimate.

Sale of Intoxicants to Chinese Labourers in the South African Mines.

CAPTAIN ELLICE (St. Andrews Burghs): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether any arrangement has been arrived at with Lord Milner with regard to the sale of intoxicants to the Chinese labourers who are to be employed in the South African mines.

MR. LYTTELTON: I have not yet received the information from Lord Milner, but expect it shortly.

Japan and Asiatic Labour in British Columbia.

MR. CHARLES DEVLIN (Galway): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether any protest has been received by His Majesty's Government from the Japanese authorities against the provisions of the Provincial Immigration Act, 1904, of British Columbia; whether he is aware that the Act in question was passed in view of the influx into that province of Asiatic labour, notwithstanding the head tax imposed, and that this influx of Asiatics has been detrimental to white labour; and whether, in view of these facts, no attempt will be made to interfere with the Provincial Immigration Act, 1904, of British Columbia.

MR. LYTTELTON: I am not aware that any protest has been made by the Japanese Government against any legislation of British Columbia this year, aiming at the restriction of Asiatic immigration. The Dominion Government has disallowed similar legislation in recent years, partly because of objections raised by the Japanese Government, and partly because it was inconsistent with legislation on immigration passed by the Dominion Parliament. I have not yet seen the text of the 1904 Act referred to, and am not aware what action the Dominion Government proposes to take in regard to it.

Transvaal Finance.

MAJOR SEELY (Isle of Wight): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention has been called to the statement made by the High Commissioner for South Africa, at the opening of the Inter-colonial Council of 31st May, 1904, to the effect that the Transvaal was paying its way, and that when compared with Cape Colony and Great Britain their financial troubles were not out of the common; and whether, in view of the fact that the introduction of Chinese indentured labour into the Transvaal was sanctioned on account of the great financial difficulties of the Transvaal, he will consider the advisability of directing that any further importation of such labour should cease now that the grave financial difficulties have been officially declared to be non-existent.

MR. LYTTELTON: My attention has been drawn to a telegraphic report which purports to give the substance of Lord Milner's statement on the occasion referred to. I do not agree with the hon. Member if he suggests that the introduction of Chinese labour was sanctioned solely by reason of the financial difficulties of the Transvaal. By stringent reductions in expenditure and by the abandonment for the time being of many most desirable works of development Lord Milner has succeeded in balancing his Estimates for the coming year, but I am not prepared, on that account, to imperil the success of his financial policy by arresting the additional supply of unskilled labour upon which the progress of the Transvaal depends.

MAJOR SEELY: Is it not a fact that this successful financial situation arose before any Chinese had arrived in South Africa?

MR. LYTTELTON: No Chinese have arrived at present. As I have already informed my hon. and gallant friend, a stringent reduction of expenditure has produced a balance in the accounts.

Russian and German Agreement.

MAJOR EVANS GORDON (Tower Hamlets, Stepney): On behalf of the hon. Member for the Walthamstow Division of

Essex, I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he has information as to an agreement between Russia and Germany, or to the conclusion of an agreement regarding Customs duties; and, if so, will he furnish this House with information as to same.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Earl PERCY, Kensington, S.): I am aware that such statements have appeared in the foreign Press; but I understand that they are without foundation.

Slavery in Zanzibar.

MR. BAYLEY (Derbyshire, Chesterfield): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is aware that the Commissioner for Pemba, appointed by the Zanzibar Government, has ruled in the Court that all property acquired by a slave, by purchase out of his own money, or by gift, belongs to the slave's master; and, if so, whether, in view of Article 2 of the decree dated 1st Zilluada, 1314, which states that from that date the district Court shall decline to enforce any alleged rights over the body, service, or property of any person on the ground that such person is a slave, he will say what action he has taken or proposes to take in the matter.

EARL PERCY: The ruling referred to by the hon. Member is probably one given by Mr. J. P. Farler, the Zanzibar Government Slavery Commissioner at Pemba, in the case of an action brought against a freed slave named Mshangama by his former master. By this ruling it was ordered that the slave's property should be taken as part payment of a claim which the master had against him, and it was further expressly stated that in all cases where a servant, before he is freed, has acquired land legitimately the law secures to him his legal right to that property, and his master cannot take it from him. It appears doubtful whether the decree dated 1st Zilluada, 1314, has any real bearing on this particular question, but as the freed slave has appealed against the judgment of Mr. Farler the matter is still *sub judice*, and it would not be proper at this stage to make any further comment on the case.

Anglo-French Agreement regarding Morocco.

MR. SEYMOUR ORMSBY-GORE: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs what communications have passed between His Shereefian Majesty the Sultan of Morocco and His Majesty's Government with regard to the Anglo-French Agreement; and if Papers containing these communications will be placed upon the Table.

*EARL PERCY: No formal communications on the subject have passed between the two Governments.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): Will the Agreement between France and Spain with regard to Morocco be laid on the Table when received.

*EARL PERCY: We are not aware that the Agreement has been concluded. Perhaps the hon. Gentleman will put down his Question.

Canadian Immigration Frauds.

MR. CHARLES DEVLIN: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called by the Canadian authorities to the existence in this country of certain agencies inducing young people to go to Canada under the pretence of educating them in farming or finding employment and charging sums of money in the form of premiums, and to frauds which are constantly being practised; and whether the Government have taken any steps to put an end to the practice where fraud is involved.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's): I am making inquiry into this matter. It is not a new one; but if the hon. Member has any facts which he can lay before me I shall be glad to have them.

Intemperance and Lunacy.

MR. HUNTER CRAIG (Lanarkshire, Govan): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he will grant a Return showing the total number of lunatics in the lunatic asylums in the United Kingdom who have lost their reason through excessive use of intoxicating liquor.

*MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS: The question of the causes to which cases of insanity can be attributed is a very difficult one. It is frequently dealt with in the Annual Reports of the Lunacy Commissioners, which give full information on the subject. In particular, I may refer my hon. friend to pages 9 and 158 to 159 of the last Report for the year 1902.

Deaths from Phosphorus Poisoning.

MR. CROOKS: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to a case of death from phosphorus poisoning that occurred at the Poplar and Stepney Sick Asylum, due to a recent attack of phossy jaw; and, if so, will he say what steps he intends to take, in view of the fact that the patent used by Messrs. Bryant and May is stated to be innocuous.

*MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS: This case has been reported to the Factory Department and carefully investigated by the district and medical inspectors of factories, as well as by the certifying surgeon. There seems to be no doubt that the case was one of phosphorus necrosis, but nothing was elicited by the inquiry or at the inquest showing how or when the disease was contracted. It appeared that the woman who died on the 19th May, 1904, had not worked at Bryant and May's factory since the autumn of 1902, except for one short period of three days. There does not appear to be any further action that I can take.

MR. CROOKS: Is it not the fact that this woman had worked there for thirty-four years, and will not the right hon. Gentleman, therefore, make further inquiry.

*MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS: I am aware that she did work there for a number of years, but there was a considerable interval between that and the appearance of the disease.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): During the three days temporary duty was she on dangerous work?

*MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS: Not according to my information, which I will, however, verify by further inquiry.

Shop Hours Bill.

MR. GALLOWAY: On behalf of the hon. Member for Peckham, I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he will postpone the Committee stage of the Shop Hours Bill until the opinion of the small shopkeepers on the Bill can be ascertained.

*MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS: I do not think that there is sufficient reason for taking this course. The whole matter—and indeed proposals very similar to those in the Bill—has engaged public attention for a long time now, and the small shopkeepers have had full opportunity of expressing their views. In particular, the Select Committee of the House of Lords in 1901 took evidence on this point and reported that the small shopkeepers were not less anxious than other classes of shopkeepers for legislation that would enable them to shorten their hours of labour.

London Street Traffic Commission.

MR. GALLOWAY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he can say when the Report of the Commission on London Street Traffic will be published.

*MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS: I am informed by the Commission that they have now finished the taking of evidence, and are considering their Report, which they hope to be able to present before the end of the year.

MR. GALLOWAY: Will there be an opportunity—providing the Report is presented before the end of the session—of discussing it?

*MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS: I can give no pledge as to that, neither can I promise the Report will be presented before the end of the session.

Reformatory School Treatment.

Mr. GALLOWAY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department what number of boys there are in reformatory schools in England and Wales; and whether he has any Reports showing what proportion of them benefit by their treatment; and, if so, whether he will lay these Reports upon the Table.

*Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS: Full information on both the points raised by my hon. friend is contained in the Annual Reports of the Inspector of Reformatory and Industrial Schools which are laid before Parliament. I may refer him, for instance, to pages 16 to 19 of the Report for 1902 published last year.

Mr. GALLOWAY: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the Report for 1903 has not yet been presented? When will it be?

*Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS: I cannot say.

Wet Drilling in Mines.

Mr. MARKHAM: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been drawn to a paper recently read before the Institution of Mining Engineers by Mr. F. Fox, M.I.C.E., and to the discussion thereon reported in Vol. 26 of the Transactions of the Society, and to the statement of this gentleman that, under the present conditions in the mines of England, one out of every five miners working rock drills in advance headings were doomed to die every year from phthisis, and that the dust from dry drillings was the chief cause of this mortality; whether he is aware that during the driving of the Simplon Tunnel, though the tunnel has reached a total length of 10¼ miles, at a depth of 9,630 yards, with a temperature ranging from 97 to 131 degrees Fahrenheit, not a single case of phthisis has occurred, owing to the absence of dry drilling; and if, under these circumstances, he will put into operation the powers he possesses under the Coal Mines Regulation Act, and prohibit the use of mechanical drills operated on the dry system, permitting only the system of wet drilling.

*Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS: This is a matter on which a close watch has been kept by my Department; and some time ago I referred it to Dr. Haldane, who, in conjunction with Mr. Martin, an inspector of mines, and Mr. Thomas, manager of Dolcoath Mine, has made a thorough inquiry into it. Their Report has been presented to Parliament and will be issued, I hope, this week. I shall proceed at once to consider the question of proposing special rules to carry out the recommendations contained in the Report

Careless Sorting at the General Post Office.

Sir GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he will inquire into the frequent complaints concerning careless sorting of newsletters in red covers, addressed to the editors of London newspapers; and whether, seeing that the newspapers pay a fee to have such letters specially sorted in the Saturday night mails, so that they may be available for delivery to their messengers on Sundays, he will take steps to see that the irregularities are discontinued.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Lord Stanley, Lancashire, Westhoughton): I will make inquiry into the matter referred to by the hon. Member, and acquaint him with the result.

The National Telephone Company and the Post Office.

Sir FREDERICK BANBURY: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General when he will be able to acquaint the House with the result of the negotiations now proceeding between the National Telephone Company and the Post Office.

Lord STANLEY: I must refer the hon. Member to the Answer which I gave on the 6th instant to a Question on this subject.† I repeat that these negotiations must take time, and I will fulfil my promise that nothing shall be done without first submitting the matter to the House of Commons, and Members will b the earliest to be informed of any resul that may be arrived at.

---

† See page 797.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Will any agreement be submitted to the House before it is finally concluded?

LORD STANLEY: Most certainly. A small Committee will report on it, and after that has been done the agreement and the Report will be submitted to the House. I cannot say that it will be this session.

Telegraphic Communication with Iceland and the Faroe Islands.

MR. DOUGHTY (Great Grimsby): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he can inform the House what progress has been made with the negotiations for connecting Iceland, the Islands of Faroe, and Great Britain with telegraphic communication.

LORD STANLEY: Negotiations are still proceeding, and I am not yet in a position to make any announcement on the subject.

Penny Postage to Australia.

SIR GILBERT PARKER: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if he will state whether an arrangement has been made for penny postage outwards to Australia; and when it will come into operation.

LORD STANLEY: It has not yet become practicable to extend the penny postage rate to letters for Australia; but the matter has been occupying my attention; and no endeavour shall be wanting on my part to arrive at a satisfactory understanding with the Commonwealth authorities.

Magazine Postage Rates to and from the Colonies.

SIR GILBERT PARKER: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether any arrangement has been made which will permit magazines to be sent to and from the Colonies at a lower rate than at present; and if he will state whether any such arrangement would entail any loss to his Department; and in that case what would be the estimated loss.

LORD STANLEY: The only exception to the ordinary rules governing the transmission of magazines between the United Kingdom and her Colonies has been made in the case of Canada, magazines from the Dominion prepaid at the Canadian inland rate of postage being delivered in this country as fully prepaid. There can be no doubt that any reduction of the postage chargeable in this country on magazines for the Colonies would entail loss of revenue to the British Post Office; but the actual amount of such loss would depend on the amount of the reduction.

Expenditure by Lighthouse Authorities.

MR. CHARLES McARTHUR (Liverpool, Exchange): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether the lighthouse authorities are required to submit all estimates for expenditure, whether for maintenance or new works, in detail, for the approval of the Board of Trade; what course is taken in case any proposed expenditure is disapproved; why the Board of Trade have limited the scope of the Advisory Committee to proposed expenditure on new works; and whether he can extend the powers of that Committee.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): The Answer to the first part of the Question is in the affirmative; if proposed expenditure is disapproved it cannot be incurred. The functions of the Advisory Committee have from the first been limited to new works. It is upon such technical matters as the position of new lighthouses or new light vessels that the advice of shipowners is of value to the Board of Trade and the lighthouse authorities. I do not think any useful purpose would be served by extending the scope of the advisory duties of the Committee.

MR. CHARLES McARTHUR: Is it not the case that ships have been excluded?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: We do not regard ships as new works. The appointment of this Committee was an act *ex gratia*. There was no obligation on the Department to appoint it.

Harbours of Refuge on the Cornish and Devonshire Coast.

MR. SOARES (Devonshire, Barnstaple): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he will state the names of the local authorities which have recently made representations, either to him or to the First Lord of the Treasury, with regard to the advisability of the construction of a harbour of refuge on the coast of North Devon or Cornwall. I may also ask the right hon. Gentleman if, having regard to the fact that the Devonshire County Council sit to-morrow, he can make any statement as to the course that ought to be pursued.

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: Representations have been received from the Cornwall County Council, the Corporations of Bideford and St. Ives, the Urban District Councils of Looe, Northam, Padstow, and Stratton and Bude, the Rural District Councils of Stratton and Barnstaple, and the Parish Council of St. Endellion. In answer to the additional Question, I am afraid I have not quite apprehended its object. I can hardly venture to give advice to the Devonshire County Council, but if any county council or local authority will next year appoint an engineer to report as to the establishment of a harbour, the site and the cost of construction, and if the report is sent to me, I will submit it to the Harbour Grants Committee for their consideration, even if the conditions laid down by the Treasury are not strictly complied with.

Lincoln and Scawby Light Railway Scheme.

Mr. SEYMOUR ORMSBY-GORE: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he will see his way to facilitate the promotion of a light railway between Lincoln and Scawby, as designed by the Light Railway Commission, and what sum of money he will recommend Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer to contribute towards the expense of making the line.

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: An Order authorising the construction of a light railway between Lincoln and Scawby was granted by the Light Railway Commissioners in 1899, under the title of the North Lincolnshire Light Railway Order, and became operative on confirmation by the Board of Trade in January, 1900. The powers so granted for the compulsory purchase of land expired in January, 1903, while the period limited for the completion of works extends to January next. So far as I am aware, the promoters of the scheme have made no exercise of their powers. The Order as submitted to and confirmed by the Board of Trade did not contemplate the grant of financial assistance on the part of the State or the local authorities, and if such assistance is now desired an amending Order would be needed. Should application be made to the Treasury in pursuance of Sections 4 and 5 of the Light Railways Act, 1896, accompanied by full particulars, the Board of Trade would, if consulted, give the matter full consideration; but I am not in a position to make any statement in advance as to the advice I should find myself able to give.

Mr. SEYMOUR ORMSBY-GORE: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the amount required to supplement the subscription by local authorities is a very small one, and does he know that this is one of the widest agricultural districts in the kingdom without railway accommodation.

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: I can only say that any proposal for a contribution from public funds must be made in the regular way, and will be considered in due course.

Illegal Trawling—Sale of Seized Tackle.

Mr. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether instructions will be issued to destroy all fishing tackle seized on boats illegally trawling instead of re-selling it.

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: In cases of illegal trawling which come within the jurisdiction of the Board, the Department is in a position to apply to the Court for destruction of the forfeited gear, and this application is made in suitable cases, but under the provisions of Section 21 (2) of the Sea Fisheries Act, 1883, the Court has a discretion to order either the destruction or sale of the gear.

Mr. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): Will the right hon. Gentleman consider the desirability of adopting the practice followed in Scotland by which a full price is always obtained for this gear.

MR. MACVEAGH: And is the right hon. Gentleman aware that as a result of the practice obtaining in Ireland the gear is generally purchased back by the trawlers?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I am afraid I can add nothing to the Answer I have given. In suitable cases the Board of Trade do recommend that the gear should be destroyed. The case is one for decision by the Courts.

Registrars of Deaths and the Press.

MR. MANSFIELD (Lincolnshire, Spalding): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that the Registrar-General has issued a notice to registrars of births and deaths not to supply lists of deaths to the Press; is he aware that the practice of supplying such lists has been working for years; and can he state the reasons given for discontinuing the list.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. WALTER LONG, Bristol, S.): I am aware that in a certain number of cases lists of deaths have been supplied to the Press by registrars of births and deaths. This, however, has been done in contravention of the regulation on the subject. The Registrar-General has received complaints as to the publication of particulars which may lead to the identification of individuals, and he considers that any such publication tends to make persons unwilling to furnish information for registration purposes, and consequently to impair the reliability of vital statistics. He has recently issued a circular with a view to a strict observance of the regulation in future.

Dog Licence Prosecutions.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he will state how many persons have been fined for keeping dogs without a licence during last year, and from the 1st January to 30th April this year, respectively, and the total amount of fines for each of the two periods; and will he say where the money is brought to account.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY (Mr. VICTOR CAVENDISH, Derbyshire, W.): I am informed by the Commissioners of Inland Revenue that it would take some considerable time to extract these particulars from their accounts. The information would hardly be worth the time and trouble spent in obtaining it. The preparation of such a Return seriously disturbs the regular work of a very busy Department. The money is credited to the Local Taxation Account, like the proceeds of the dog licences. The total amount so credited for fines and penalties in connection with the Local Taxation Licences in 1902–3 was £6,815.

MR. WEIR: I shall take an early opportunity of calling attention to this matter.

Humanised Calf Lymph in Scotland.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland, having regard to the fact that the medical officers for the nine parishes in Scotland who applied last year for humanised lymph in preference to glycerinated calf lymph based their preference on the assumption that the former lymph was more potent, will he state whether the Local Government Board for Scotland have taken steps to point out to these officers that statistics show the percentage of successful vaccination with glycerinated calf lymph to be distinctly higher than the percentage of successes with humanised lymph?

*THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire): I am informed that the reason given by the medical officers referred to for preferring humanised to glycerinated calf lymph was not that the former was more potent, but that it kept its potency for a longer period. The Local Government Board for Scotland see no reason for directing the attention of these officers to the statistics of relative success of the two varieties of lymph.

Lymph supplied to the Central Vaccine Institution for Scotland.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether Dr. Cadell, as superintendent of vaccination at the new town dispensary, Edinburgh, still collects vaccine lymph from the arms of children vaccinated by him, and thus supplies humanised lymph to the Central Vaccine Institution for Scotland; and, seeing that the last report of the medical superintendent of that institution shows that the percentage of successful vaccination with glycerinated calf lymph is higher than the percentage of success with humanised lymph, will the question of using glycerinated calf lymph for the whole of the work of parochial vaccinators in Scotland be considered, especially having regard to the fact that the use of humanised lymph has been widely condemned?

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: I am informed that Dr. Cadell still supplies humanised lymph to the Central Vaccine Institution for Scotland. The difference in the percentage of successes between glycerinated calf lymph and humanised lymph does not appear to constitute sufficient ground for ceasing to supply humanised lymph, which is still in demand.

Cummertrees Parish School.

MR. MAXWELL (Dumfries-shire): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland if the Education Department have sanctioned the building of a new school in Cummertrees parish, and if the Department have withdrawn their approval of the addition to the present school, a plan of which the School Board in the first instance submitted to them; and whether, in this and in similar cases where His Majesty's Inspectors of Schools require additional accommodation, involving large capital expenditure, to be provided, the Department will not withold their approval of such expenditure until the new education authorities are constituted under the Education Bill now before the House.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: It is not the case that the Department withdrew approval of the addition to the school at first proposed. The School Board at their own instance proposed a new school in place of this addition. The Department cannot undertake to withhold approval of such expenditure pending the constitution of new authorities where, as in the present instance, further school accommodation is urgently required.

Trinity College Lands Commission.

MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can give the names of the gentlemen who have been appointed to serve on the Commission to inquire into the question of Trinity College lands.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.): My right hon. friend hopes to be able to announce the names of the members of the Commission in a few days.

Labourers (Ireland) Bill.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can now state whether it is his intention to proceed with the Labourers (Ireland) Bill; and, if so, can he fix the date for the Second Reading.

MR. ATKINSON: Yes, sir. My right hon. friend intends to proceed with the Bill. But he cannot name a date for the Second Reading, which is a matter rather for the Prime Minister.

Ballinasloe Asylum Medical Staff.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Committee of the Ballinasloe Asylum have fixed the maximum age of applicants for the position of junior assistant medical officer at 40; whether this is in accordance with the regulations governing such appointments; and, if so, what steps he proposes to take in regard to the matter.

MR. ATKINSON: The reply to the first inquiry is in the affirmative. The Asylum Committee was informed, however, that the maximum age limit prescribed by the statutory regulations is thirty-two years, and they have now decided to advertise for candidates possessing the statutory qualifications.

Dublin Victuallers' Assessment Protest.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he has received a resolution from the Dublin Victuallers Association protesting against the assessments sought to be levied on the members; and, if so, whether he will make inquiries into this complaint with a view to having the assessments made upon a fair basis.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.): I have received the resolution from the Dublin Victuallers Association to which the hon. Member refers, but this is not a matter in which I can take action. Anyone who is dissatisfied with his assessment has a right of appeal to the Special Commissioners of Taxes, from whose decision a further appeal may be made to the Recorder or County Court Judge, as the case may be, the authority in Dublin being the Recorder, and I am unable to interfere with the ordinary procedure prescribed by the law.

Materials to be used in building the New College of Science, Dublin.

Mr. FIELD: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether it will be arranged in connection with the construction of the new College of Science, Dublin, by the Board of Works, that Irish stone will be specified for use in building, and that, as far as possible, Irish material shall be used and Irish workmen employed.

Mr. VICTOR CAVENDISH: It is not possible at this stage to come to any decision on the subject of the materials to be used in the building of the Royal College of Science, Dublin; but preference will be given to Irish material if it is in all respects equally suitable.

Irish Legislation.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he can now say when he proposes to take the Second Reading of the Irish Land Bill and the Irish Labourers Bill.

The PRIME MINISTER and FIRST LORD of the TREASURY (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.): I am unable at present to fix a date for the Second Reading of the Irish Land Bill and the Irish Labourers Bill. I will give full notice of the fixing of a date.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: Does the right hon. Gentleman think it fair to keep back all Irish legislative business right to the end of the session?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not think it is a question of fairness or unfairness. I am anxious naturally to use to the best advantage the amount of time at the disposal of the House to deal with the legislative work the Government have in hand. Casting my eye back over the legislative work of many years past, I do not think that the Irish Members have much reason to complain.

Chinese Labour in Rhodesia.

Mr. TREVELYAN (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether the Government intend, in the case of Rhodesia, to depart from the principle, first laid down by the Member for West Birmingham, that Chinese labour should not be introduced into South Africa against the will of the inhabitants; whether he has read the views of Sir Marshall Clarke to the effect that the majority of the people of Rhodesia do not favour the introduction of such labour; and whether he will give the House an opportunity of expressing its opinion before sanction is given to the introduction of Chinese into Rhodesia.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: The Government adhere to the general statement of principle to which the hon. Gentleman refers in the earlier part of his Question. No decision has been come to in regard to the introduction of Chinese labour into Rhodesia; but I can give no pledge to the House, for reasons more than once stated, that a special day will be given for the consideration of the subject.

Mr. TREVELYAN: Did not the right hon. Gentleman say that the reason for not giving the House an opportunity was that the same principles applied to Rhodesia that applied to the Transvaal?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I think the principles are the same.

Mr. TREVELYAN: I have pointed out in my Question that they are not the same.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: The hon. Gentleman has not touched on any question of principle in his Question, except in the first paragraph, and there I am at one with him.

War Office Reconstitution Committee's Report.

*Mr. CHAPMAN (Cheshire, Hyde): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he can give any date when the House may have the opportunity of discussing the Report of the War Office Reconstitution Committee.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I propose to put down the Vote for the salary of the Secretary of State for War on a very early Thursday, and I imagine that on that Vote it will be competent to discuss the Report of the Reconstitution Committee.

*Sir CHARLES DILKE: I assume the right hon. Gentleman will remember that on three previous occasions he pointed out that the Defence Committee of the Cabinet could not be discussed on that Vote, and that he would have to give another opportunity for its discussion.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: Yes; but I think we shall have to put down a Supplementary Estimate for the Defence Committee of the Cabinet, because, as the House knows, the Committee has a staff which has not been provided for by this House.

Volunteer Vote.

Mr. SEYMOUR ORMSBY-GORE: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury when it is proposed to take the Volunteer Vote.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I cannot say, but I will give full notice of the Vote, as I cannot now fix a day for its discussion.

Mr. SEYMOUR ORMSBY-GORE: Will it be subsequent to the Vote for the salary of the Secretary of State for War?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: Yes, Sir; it will be.

Mr. McCRAE (Edinburgh, E.): Will it be possible before the Vote comes on to make a statement with regard to the decision of the Government as to the Report of the Commission which has just concluded its sittings?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I think it probable that my right hon. friend the Secretary of State for War will make a very broad and general statement with regard to the military policy of the Government. Whether he will refer in detail to the recent Report of the Commission I cannot now say.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): When the Secretary of State for War has made that broad and general statement, which I hope will also be a detailed and comprehensive statement, will the right hon. Gentleman endeavour to give the House time to digest it before being called upon to discuss it?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I will consider whether some arrangement cannot be come to. I think it is a matter in which my right hon. friend near me will be able to make an arrangement satisfactory to the House.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I do not suggest that the Government should give a greater amount of time.

The Penal Servitude Bill.

Mr. LOUGH: I wish to ask the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister whether he is aware that a long Paper issued by the Home Office respecting the rules and regulations to be made under the Penal Servitude Bill appeared in *The Times* of to-day, and that it has not yet been placed in the hands of Members and cannot be obtained in the Vote Office, and whether in the circumstances he will proceed with the Bill to-day.

*Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS: Perhaps I may be allowed to answer the Question. I saw what purport to be the rules and regulations in the paper this morning. They were not published by my authority, and I am astonished they should have appeared. I promised that these rules should be published before the Committee stage on the Bill was taken, and I will see that that promise is adhered to.

MR. LOUGH: I should like to ask whether the right hon. Gentleman will make inquiry as to how this got out, and take some action. Surely the Government will not persist in going on with the order in the circumstances? There is a great question of principle involved, which may affect the judgment of the House.

*MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS: I really do not follow the hon. Gentleman's argument. The promise given in the House the other day was that the rules should be published before the discussion was taken in Grand Committee. I do not see how what has happened can affect the Motion for committal to the Grand Committee. I regret the incident, because I think that the House of Commons should have all Papers first. I do not see any reason why we should not proceed with the reference to the Grand Committee.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The right hon. Gentleman said he was astonished to find that these new regulations were in the paper. I hope he will not stop at astonishment, but will take some steps to punish those who have committed this offence and to prevent the recurrence of it. We have had so many cases like it.

*MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS: I must first make inquiry to see how they got there.

CAPTAIN NORTON: Are these the actual rules?

*MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS: I have not yet had time to compare them.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: May I ask what the general business next week will be, and what particular first-class Bill will be the subject of the debate?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It has been generally expected—and I see no reason for disappointing the expectation—that the Scotch Education Bill will be the first business, and the Port of London Bill will be taken next. I cannot make any statement at present as to the Supply to be taken on Thursday next week. Friday next week is the last private Members' Friday. With regard to the Supply to be taken to-morrow, in accordance with a request made to me through the authorised channels, I propose to put down the Foreign Office Vote first, the Diplomatic and Consular Vote next, and after that some Votes in Class I. and Reports of Supply.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Has the right hon. Gentleman any peculiar means of knowing that the Scotch and Metropolitan Members are the Members least likely to go to Ascot?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I hope that the love of sport is equally diffused over all parts of the House.

DR. FARQUHARSON (Aberdeenshire, W.): Will the right hon. Gentleman continue the discussion of the Scotch Education Bill *de die in diem*.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No, Sir; I cannot promise to go on with the Bill through all eternity. If we do not finish it on Monday we shall take it on Tuesday. I think that looking forward for a week is as much as any Leader of the House can be called upon to do.

CHINESE OVERSEERS—MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT REFUSED BY THE SPEAKER.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL (Yorkshire, Cleveland): I beg to ask whether I am precluded by the notices which stand on the Notice Paper from asking leave to move the adjournment of the House in order to discuss a definite matter of urgent public importance — namely, "the non-fulfilment of the undertaking given by Ministers in this House that the employment of Chinese labourers in South Africa will not lead to the exclusion of English workmen from forms of work hitherto performed by them."

*MR. SPEAKER: I understand the hon. Gentleman to say that the Government and others have suggested that one of the consequences of the importation of Chinese labour would be the employment of more white men, and that that will not turn out to be the result. That is obviously one of the matters to be discussed on the general question of the desirability of the importation of Chinese labour, and is covered by the notices on the Paper.

Mr. McKENNA (Monmouthshire, N.): The point is whether a blocking Motion can cover a state of facts that had not arisen at the time it was set down. The point now raised is that as a matter of fact Chinese labourers are asked to do work hitherto done by white labour.

***Mr. SPEAKER**: Chinese labour whether performed by a foreman or under a foreman is Chinese labour all the same.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar): As I understand the question, my hon. friend does not intend to deal with the merits of the question of the importation of Chinese labour, but with the question whether a pledge given by a Minister of the Crown in this House has or has not been fulfilled. I do not think any hon. Member has yet put down a Motion which covers all the breaches of faith on the part of His Majesty's Government.

***Mr. SPEAKER**: I have nothing to add to the Answer which I have given.

PUBLIC PETITIONS COMMITTEE.

Seventh Report brought up, and read; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

FOREIGN SHIPS (APPLICATION OF STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS).

The Select Committee on Foreign Ships (Application of Statutory Requirements) was nominated of, Mr. Evelyn Cecil, Mr. Crean, Mr. Charles Devlin, Sir William Doxford, Mr. Munro Ferguson, Mr. Leverton Harris, Mr. John Johnson, Mr. Bonar Law, Mr. Charles McArthur, Mr. McKenna, Mr. David Morgan, Sir Albert Rollit, Mr. Runciman, Mr. Wolff, and Sir James Woodhouse.

Ordered, That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records.

Ordered, That Five be the quorum.—(*Sir A. Acland-Hood.*)

TUBERCULOSIS (ANIMALS) COMPENSATION BILL.

The Select Committee on the Tuberculosis (Animals) Compensation Bill was nominated of, Mr. Barran, Dr. Farquharson, Mr. Field, Mr. Ernest Gray, Dr. Hutchinson, Captain Jessel, Mr. Kilbride, Mr. Grant Lawson, Mr. A. K. Loyd, Mr. Price, Mr. Spear, Sir John Stirling-Maxwell, Sir Edward Strachey, Sir Mark Stewart, and Mr. Austin Taylor.

Ordered, that the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records.

Ordered, That Five be the quorum.—(*Sir A. Acland-Hood.*)

ALIENS BILL.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Order for Committee be read and discharged; and that the Bill be committed to the Standing Committee on Law, etc."—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

Mr. TREVELYAN (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland) said it was curious that a Motion of that nature should be taken as a matter of course by the Government. The Standing Order by which Grand Committees were instituted contained these words—

> "Two Standing Committees shall be appointed for the consideration of all Bills relating to law and Courts of justice and legal procedure, and to trade, shipping, and manufactures."

If they looked at the character of this Bill they would find that there was absolutely nothing in it which brought it within either of the categories set forth in that Standing Order. It was first proposed, he believed, to send this Bill to the Committee on Trade. For what reason he did not know, but perhaps it was because of the injury it might be alleged to do to shipping. That idea, however, was abandoned, and then it was proposed to send it to the Committee on Law. When these Grand Committees were instituted Mr. Gladstone explained what was intended by them, and said there was a question as to what was a Law Bill, although every Bill was practically a Law Bill in one sense. He thought, however, that the House would agree—at any rate those who had read the Aliens Bill would agree—that there was absolutely nothing which brought it within the category of a Law Bill. It was a Bill which embodied a great alteration in the public policy of the country. It was a Bill which involved a wide breach of national traditions and in its character it had no more to do with law than had the Home Rule Bill, the Agricultural Rates Bill, or the Anglo-French Convention Bill. It was highly controversial in its character, and he could easily point out in it points of public policy which the House ought to discuss in Committee of the Whole House. He would take care not to say anything on the merits of those points of policy. He proposed only to mention three or four of the chief proposals of the Bill in order that the House might see that they were questions which vitally affected the policy and traditions of the country. First there was the question of the right of asylum; next there was the alleged danger of excluding under the cover of pauperism persons or classes who were, in fact, political refugees coming to this country. There had in the past been in that House hot contests, involving the fate of Governments, on questions relating to political refugees. That was eminently a question with which the House should deal, and at the present moment it was a matter of special importance because since the Second Reading of the Bill it had been stated that the Russian Government had been entering into relations with other countries, though, he believed, not with this country, with a view to taking measures to send back anarchists from one country to another when they tried to enter. Therefore, he suggested that this was one of the questions of public policy. The Bill also contained proposals for keeping people out of this country on the ground of pauperism, and pauperism alone. There again the traditional policy which this country had pursued for centuries of permitting people to enter without inquiring as to their means or position was being interfered with. There were also proposals to give discretionary power to the Secretary of State to order aliens to leave the Kingdom on the representation of a common informer. Was not that also a change of national policy? If it were not, he did not know what would be. Then there were extraordinary and novel proposals to limit the power of residence of aliens in certain districts in London and other towns, a method which was suggested to deal with the grave question of overcrowding. There was evidence of the general interest taken in this Bill to be found in the number of Amendments which had been placed upon the Paper. There were many pages of these Amendments, a large number of which dealt with questions of policy, and he would like to point out to the House the fact that many of those Amendments were put down by hon. Members who were not members of the Grand Committee on Law. As a matter of fact some twenty Members had got Amendments down who were not on that Committee. It might be said that it was open to the Committee of Selection to put some of those Gentlemen on the Committee, and possibly those Gentlemen might be placated by the adoption of that course, but his point was that the number of Amendments proved the general and wide interest felt throughout the House in that question.

There were, he believed, two reasons why the Government wished to send this Bill to the Committee on Law. The first was that the business of the House was becoming somewhat congested. He would, however, like to point out that the congestion of business at the present time was part y due to the fact that the Government were proposing to take in Committee of the Whole House what was practically a non-contentious Bill, namely, the Scotch Education Bill. That Bill was absolutely non-contentious in its main principles. Contention was only likely to arise on points of detail. It was, however, a Bill which would occupy a great deal of time, and which would involve an enormous amount of detailed discussion.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

Mr. TREVELYAN said he did not wish to press the point, but he would like to state shortly what he was leading up to. It was that the Prime Minister had placed himself in this difficulty. He was sending to the Committee on Law a very contentious Bill when there was another Bill which could have been dealt with in a similar manner, and which would have made room for this Aliens Bill but for the fact that the Prime Minister had persistently taken up the line that there should not be a Scotch Committee for specially Scotch business.

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! That point is quite foreign to the matter under debate.

Mr. TREVELYAN said he would not pursue the matter further. His point was that the chief reason why this Bill ought to be kept in the House of Commons was that it was one of a highly contentious character, and he thought that there could be no doubt whatever that the tradition of the House in regard to the question of Standing Committees was that no Bills of a contentious character should be sent to them. He would like to quote a passage from a speech by Sir Henry James on the night of the 17th April, 1894, describing the conditions under which these Grand Committees were instituted. In that speech it was laid down that the Bills remitted to these Grand Committees should be always of a non-contentious character. He would also like to refer to a speech made in 1882 by Mr. W. H. Smith, who laid down a similar doctrine. If he were not mistaken this Aliens Bill was referred to in the Speech from the Throne, and, therefore, it was presumably one of the leading Bills of the Government. He could not understand the action of the Government in this matter unless their desire was to get rid of opportunities for further discussion in that House. They were apparently afraid of more serious criticism. It must not be forgotten that during the Second Reading debate an uncomfortable discovery was made when it was found that the Home Secretary, who was in charge of the Bill, had exaggerated and had multiplied by ten the number of aliens coming into this country.

*The SECRETARY of STATE for the HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. Akers-Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's) said he explained and corrected that error at the time, and he quite understood that the hon. Member accepted his explanation.

Mr. TREVELYAN said that that was so, but his point was that the Government having once been convicted of an exaggerated statement, although they were delighted that the right hon. Gentleman had acknowledged his error, they felt that there was still danger that further debate might expose other exaggerations, and they believed that it was to avoid such exposure that this course was taken.

Mr. LOUGH (Islington, W.) said that the proposal to send this Bill to a Grand Committee was one of the most outrageous he had ever heard, and he thought the very construction of the Motion which was in the hands of the Speaker would show the desirability of dealing in the House itself with a Bill of that kind. Undoubtedly it was the original intention of the Government to deal with this matter in the House. It could not be forgotten that the Bill was the first one mentioned in His Majesty's Speech, and, therefore, presumably, it was the most important measure in the programme of the Government for the present year. What, then, were the reasons for the extraordinary change of policy which the Government had adopted in regard to the Bill? It was almost an open secret that since the discussion upon the Second Reading difficulties had been growing, and naturally the Government were desirous of hustling the Bill through by means of a Grand Committee so as to avoid discussion, because they feared that if it were dealt with in Committee of the Whole House it would be rejected almost instantaneously. Since the Second Reading debate a most distinguished representative of the Home Office, Sir Kenelm Digby, Permanent Secretary of the Home Office and an important member of the Royal Commission, upon whose Report the Bill was founded, had been writing letters upon the subject and when they had so distinguished an authority as Sir Kenelm Digby taking up the position he did, it was not desirable that the Bill should be hustled through by means of a Grand Committee. He believed it was because the Government had realised the increasing difficulty of dealing with this question that they had resolved to take a different course in regard to the Bill than that which was at first intended. It was generally admitted that Grand Committees were not well suited to deal with very contentious matters which raised new principles. He could assure the Government that every clause of this Bill would require very careful consideration, and that points of much greater importance were involved in it than the House at first realised. They had an attempt last year to deal with the subject on some trifling lines when they were dealing with criminal or destitute aliens.

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Member is now discussing the Bill.

Mr. LOUGH said he was, of course, prepared absolutely to obey the rulings of the Chair, but he was trying to suggest reasons why the Bill should not be sent to the Grand Committee, and he wanted to point out that it proposed to set up a system of passports in this a country which did not distinguish between foreigners and colonists. It was an extraordinary thing that the Government should attempt to send a Bill of such far-reaching importance to a Grand Committee. For instance, there was Clause 4, which set up what he might call congested districts, and which enabled the Local Government Board by Order in Council without the consent of Parliament to declare the number of people who should be allowed to live in a particular district. Surely that was very far-reaching.

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! It is quite irregular to discuss these details.

Mr. LOUGH said he would not pursue the argument further, but he must say he thought it would be better if the Government would stick to their original intention and have the Bill discussed in Committee of the Whole House. He regretted that no attempt had been made by anyone representing the Government to explain the reasons why they had made this proposal.

Mr. GALLOWAY (Manchester, S.W.) said he entirely agreed with the principles in reference to Standing Committees laid down by the hon. Member for the Elland Division, but he did not find the hon. Gentleman always acted up to those principles, as, for instance, in reference to the Deceased Wife's Sister Bill. He wished to address himself to the point as to whether this was a proper Bill to go to a Grand Committee or not. It appeared to him that the House must make a rule in these matters. They must either regularly refuse to send any contentious Bills to Grand Committees or not, because if they sent one they could not in reason refuse to send another. He had referred to the Deceased Wife's Sister Bill.

Mr. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs): That was a private Member's Bill.

Mr. GALLOWAY asked if it were intended by that to be suggested that the principle to be observed was that contentious bills introduced by private Members could be sent to a Grand Committee but if they were introduced by the Government they could not. That was, he was sure, a form of argument which the House would never accept. He thought the House would be very ill advised if it once began to draw such a distinction between private Members and members of the Government. All Members, so far as the House was concerned, had always been treated as having equal rights, and he should be sorry to see anything done which would detract from or minimise that custom. This Bill did not appear to him to be any more contentious than many other Bills which had already been sent to Grand Committees. He objected to Bills being sent to Grand Committees at all, because when he first came into the House his attention was drawn by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Isle of Thanet to the effect of this procedure, and he was convinced that the system was a pernicious one. If, however, objection was taken to the reference of this particular Bill to a Grand Committee because it was not a private Member's Bill, he would remind the House that in 1894 the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Fife moved that the Employers Liability Bill should be sent to a Grand Committee. The Employers

Liability Bill was as contentious as this Bill, and he failed to see on what principle they should refuse to send the Bill to a Grand Committee.

Mr. ASQUITH (Fifeshire, E.): The Employers Liability Bill was not a contentious Bill.

Mr. GALLOWAY: If the right hon. Gentleman will carry his memory back to the discussions he conducted with very great ability, I think he will admit that it was a contentious Bill.

Mr. ASQUITH: It had one contentious clause, but the whole of the rest of the Bill was accepted by the House.

Mr. GALLOWAY said the right hon. Gentleman was in an illogical position if, having made that admission, he objected to contentious Bills being sent to Grand Committees. He expressed regret that the Government had changed their proposal. The Motion originally in the name of the Home Secretary was to refer this Bill to the Grand Committee on Trade, but the Motion on the Paper was to send it to the Grand Committee on Law. His right hon. friend the Member for North East Manchester said that one Committee was busy and the other was not. That might be true, but he did not admit the contention so far as the present state of business was concerned. They ought not to decide whether a Bill should go to one Committee or another according to the state of business in those Committees. The way they ought to decide it was clearly laid down in the Standing Orders, namely, that certain Bills should be sent to one Committee and certain Bills of another class should be sent to the other Committee. This did not appear to him to be a Bill to refer to the Grand Committee on Law. The other Bills relating to the same Department, namely, the Home Office, were before the Standing Committee on Trade, and if the Aliens Bill were sent to the Grand Committee on Law it would be difficult for the Home Secretary to attend both Committees.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): I do not know that the question as between the Committee on Trade and the Committee on Law is one of great importance. I think they have become very much mixed in the course of our transactions for many years, and I suspect if the hon. Gentleman who has spoken just now had the advantage of consulting the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Isle of Thanet, from whom he originally derived his opinions on the subject, he would find that that right hon. Gentleman does not care a straw which of the two Committees you send the Bill to, he dislikes them both so much. I very much agree with my hon. friends behind me, and I see reasons why this Bill should not be sent to a Committee upstairs, but should be dealt with before the Committee of the Whole House. We have received from the Government as yet no reason whatever why this Bill should be dealt with in an exceptional way. My friends who have spoken in favour of keeping it in the House have dwelt especially upon the contentious nature of the measure. The words contentious and non-contentious are rather ambiguous. What do you mean by non-contentious in regard to a Bill? Such a thing does not exist. If you mean a Bill that nobody in any corner of the House has the slightest objection to, it must be a very remarkable Bill, a somewhat ingenious Bill, and probably it would be a very worthless Bill if some fault cannot be found with it by somebody or other. But that is not what is meant, as I understand. What is meant, and what we should call a non-contentious measure, is one which does not raise any great division of opinion in the House and which is accepted on its main stages by the great body of the House, and although there might be, as in the case of the Employers Liability Bill, here a clause and there a clause which creates controversy, the rest of the Bill being to the taste of the House, it may very well be treated as a non-contentious Bill. But this Bill is very much more than a contentious Bill. Not only is it very bitterly and keenly opposed and resented on practical, sentimental, and historical grounds by many of us, but it is also a Bill which introduces a new constitutional practice and principle. We are now going for the first time—it may be right to do it, or it may be wrong—to set up a great, elaborate, and deliberate system of keeping foreigners of a certain kind out of the country. Well, that is surely a departure from our ordinary practice, a departure from the traditions and from the general and historical attitude of this country, and on that ground, apart from the fact of the people being divided in opinion about it, it ought to be kept before the House, and the detailed provisions of it ought to be discussed before the people in the light of day and not in a room upstairs. That is the main ground on which I entirely agree with those who say that the ordinary course should be followed. Whether it will save time is another question altogether. There is no Bill before the House this session which has a more distinctly revolutionary principle in it than this Bill. None. And it is to be treated as if it were of no account at all and sent to be dealt with by a Grand Committee as if it were some little Bill about local government, or a trade bill about the general provisions of which opinion both in the House and out of it was agreed. That is the ground on which it seems to me it ought to be kept in the House, and I hope the Government will yet agree to do this, because from the very fact that they have shown reluctance hitherto to indicate any reason for taking another course, I fancy that they cannot have a very strong opinion on the subject themselves. If they put aside the mere question of the convenience of business, which may or may not be of force, on the merit of the question as to the nature of the Bill I would ask is this not distinctly out of the category of Bills which can be dealt with in that way, and is the country outside not entitled to have it discussed in all its details with the greatest publicity and in the fullest way so that every Member, whether he be a trade Member or a lawyer, shall have an opportunity of expressing his opinion upon it?

*MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS: The right hon. Gentleman who has just addressed the House has described this Bill as one of great controversy and great contention. I confess that is rather news to me considering the tone which prevailed during the Second Reading discussion on the Bill. The right hon. Gentleman who moved the rejection of the Bill on the Second Reading in a most able and most moderate speech said that, while it was a measure to which he himself was opposed, he had little doubt that the assent of this House would be given to it—[OPPOSITION cries of "No"]—and I think it is too late to say that this Bill is one which is looked upon by the House or the country as a measure of very great contention. The Second Reading of the measure was carried by a very large majority in this House. The Bill was passed with the support of a number of hon. Members opposite, and of certain right hon. Gentlemen who sit on the Front Bench opposite. I quite agree with the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition that it is very difficult to define what is a contentious measure, but this Bill does not provoke anything like the unanimous opposition of hon. Gentlemen opposite, while it receives unanimous support on the Ministerial side of the House. The class of Bill especially suitable for consideration in Grand Committee is one which contains one important question of principle, and the rest of which is taken up with provisions for the application of that principle. The Aliens Bill is of that nature. Its principle is the exclusion from, or the regulation of, the admission to this country of undesirable aliens, and that has been accepted by a majority of 124. It now only remains to define what classes of undesirable aliens should be excluded, and to provide the machinery for that exclusion, or for the regulations if we are to admit them to this country.

Some allusion has been made by the hon. Member for Islington to Amendments on the Paper which, he says, are very largely against the principle of the Bill. But I am bound to say that in looking at these Amendments I cannot come to the same conclusion. None of the Amendments on the Paper are opposed to the principle of the Bill, and only one proposes the omission of a clause: that dealing with the congested districts. Bills of equal magnitude have before now been sent to the Grand Committees, among them the Employers Liability Bill, which was most contentious in one clause, involving an absolutely new principle; the Prisons Bill, the Habitual Inebriates Bill, both of these dealing with questions of personal liberty; and the Court of Criminal Appeal Bill. Really I can see very little difference between this Bill and those Bills

The hon. Member opposite said that this Bill is extremely controversial both in this House and the country. Well, that is certainly not my impression from the resolutions which have reached me on this question. It is true there have been certain resolutions connected with two questions dealt with in the Bill, in both of which I pointed out on the Second Reading there was a misunderstanding. There was first of all the question of political refugees, and I have already given assurances that there is no intention to exclude that class of aliens, and we will accept an Amendment to that effect.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): You cannot do that.

*MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS: I venture to say that it is perfectly easy to so arrange an Amendment as to make our intention on that matter perfectly clear. Some hon. Members have said that the Government are sending this Bill to the Grand Committee more as a question of expediency because we find that the state of business in the House is such that a Bill of this character would not be likely to pass through Committee of the Whole House at so late a period of the session. Well, there is no doubt that this Bill will receive much better attention in Grand Committee. All points of detail will be there thoroughly thrashed out; and it will afterwards come before the House at a later stage, as amended, for further discussion. There has been no change in the intention of the Government. We have always believed that this Bill should and could properly be referred to a Grand Committee. The division on the Second Reading was not taken till midnight, and there was no opportunity of moving that it be remitted to the Grand Committee on Law.

MR. DALZIEL: It was the Grand Committee on Trade, not on Law.

*MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS: Yes, it was the Grand Committee on Trade, but at present I point out that the issue now before the House is not whether it should go to the Grand Committee on Trade or Law, but whether it should go upstairs. I trust that the House will agree to refer the Bill to the Committee on Law, and I am quite certain that those who wish to arrive at a satisfactory conclusion on this question will do far better to vote for its reference upstairs than to keep it for Committee of the Whole House, because it will be more thoroughly considered there than here.

MR. ASQUITH: It has been admitted that upon a Motion of this kind we cannot enter in any degree into the details of the measure. But at the same time there are always two questions to be borne in mind when it is proposed to withdraw a Bill from Committee of the Whole House to a Committee upstairs. These are: what is the nature of the measure itself, and what is the character of the precedent about to be set for those who come afterwards. Whether the one test or the other is applied, this is pre-eminently a Bill over which the House ought to retain its own complete and undelegated jurisdiction. If the controversial character of a measure were to be measured by the size of the majority in its favour, it is only necessary to have a Ministerial majority large and docile enough to remove every measure from the arena of controversy. Every argument that can be used in favour of referring this Bill to a Standing Committee might be used with equal plausibility in favour of referring the Licensing Bill to a Standing Committee, and even the Government has not advanced as far as that. The procedure on the Employers Liability Bill has been quoted as a precedent justifying the action of the Government, but the Second Reading of that Bill had been carried without a division. When the Motion was made for the reference of the Bill to the Standing Committee, the present Prime Minister made a very half-hearted protest, arguing that the Bill ought rather to go to a Select Committee. "We are all desirous that a Bill on this subject should pass," the right hon. Gentleman had said. The Motion of reference was carried without a division, yet so strong was the feeling against it that a large number of Gentleman on the opposite side refused to take any part in the proceedings of the Grand Committee, and insisted on re-discussing every point on Report. The case is therefore entirely differentf rom that of the present Bill. The Home Secretary said that no one has put down an Amendment for the omission of a clause. I am sorry to hear it, and I shall immediately proceed to put down such Amendments. There is not a single clause of the Bill which does not bristle with contentious matter. It introduces not only an innovation, but a revolution of the traditions and precedents which have hitherto governed the legislation and administration of this country in regard to the admission of foreigners. It is an abuse of language to compare this Bill with any of the measures which the Home Secretary has mentioned.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis) said that the onus for making out a case for the withdrawal of the Bill from the ordinary procedure of this House rested with the Government. He was not concerned to debate the respective merits of the Grand Committee on Law or the Grand Committee on Trade. To whichever Committee the Bill was referred it would constitute an undesirable precedent. Let the House consider the enormous advantage to be derived from a discussion in Committee of the Whole House. Every kind of question arose and was answered; questions were submitted from different aspects; and Members were allowed to make more than one speech. When a Bill was sent to a Grand Committee and brought down again to this House, a Member was only allowed to make one speech on Report. That was a very serious injury to the future of a Bill. Every hon. Member who had assisted in passing a Bill through the ordinary Committee of the House knew that from some unexpected quarter most valuable suggestions were often advanced, and were adopted by the Minister in charge of the Bill. When a Bill was sent to a Grand Committee, seven-eighths of the House were suppressed and withdrawn from the Committee on the Bill; and the consequence was that there was only one-eighth of the chance of good suggestions being offered for the improvement of the Bill. What justification did the Home Secretary give for this Motion? He said, first of all, that the principle of the Bill was accepted, and that it only remained to define the conditions under which aliens were to be admitted or excluded. That was exactly the kind of work in which the House of Commons did ten times as well as any Standing Committee. It was in Committee of the Whole House that the opportunity arose for making suggestions which often proceeded from hon. Members who were hardly expected to speak on the Bill at all. Then the Home Secretary said that the Bill would receive much better attention in the Grand Committee than in this House. On what did the right hon. Gentleman found that? He maintained it was entirely contrary to the experience of the House. He had some experience of the House; and he knew perfectly well that in Committee of the Whole House a Bill of this character would be certain to receive the most careful attention. The right hon. Gentleman, however, at last betrayed his real reason. He said that if they sent the Bill up to the Grand Committee it would have a greater chance of passing. But the great object of this House was debate. This was a Parliament House, and it was better that they should debate and discuss a Bill thoroughly and not pass it, than pass it without having debated it thoroughly. The great object of the Home Secretary was to get the Bill passed anyhow or somehow; and he had really the assurance to say that it was better that it should be considered upstairs than in this House.

This was undoubtedly a very important Bill. It would reverse the whole of the conditions of the country, and rescind and break through the laws of hospitality which they had always extended to the poor and oppressed of every country; and from the exercise of which they themselves had received benefit. Every oppressed man that came to this country brought something that had added to its security, its industry, and its reputation. It was something to know that this was the one land in all the world where the oppressed might find a refuge. Whether it was necessary or advisable to alter those laws he did not pretend to say. The Bill proposed the adoption of conditions which were known in Continental countries, and which were not perhaps a credit to them. It was a contentious measure; and the House should not allow it to be withdrawn from full discussion, in exchange for a miserable and inferior discussion upstairs where there would not be the facilities and convenient circumstances which attached to a

Committee of the Whole House. He himself considered Standing Committees to be most improper bodies to have been set up in this Parliament at all. They were usurpations, and every Bill referred to them was a Bill really withdrawn from proper debate in Parliament, for which this House existed. Under these circumstances he would be bound to vote against the Motion.

Mr. McKENNA (Monmouthshire, N.) said that whatever decision the House might come to on this Motion, every hon. Member would agree that it was highly desirable that there should be some consistency in the principle on which Bills were sent to Grand Committees. He had endeavoured to form his opinion on this subject on the best models; and he naturally turned to the Prime Minister, and to the views expressed by him on previous occasions, in order to come to a judgment on this Motion. The Prime Minister had, in and out of office, declared himself upon this subject with the greatest consistency. In 1894, on the Motion to send the Employers Liability Bill to a Grand Committee the Prime Minister expressed himself with the greatest clearness. In dealing with the principle on which a Bill should be sent to a Grand Committee he said that if any large section of the House were not satisfied with the consideration of the Grand Committee, it was in their power to raise on Report all the questions which could be raised in Committee of the Whole House, and that, therefore, if reference to a Grand Commiitee did not meet with general assent, no real saving of time was effected in attempting to avoid the Committee stage. The Prime Minister did not, however, cover the whole ground. It was not only that there would be no saving of time in this House by sending contentious Bills to a Grand Committee, but also that the time of the Grand Committee would be wasted, months being perhaps occupied to the exclusion of other Bills which could be satisfactorily dealt with by a Grand Committee. When a contentious Bill was sent back to the House they would have to go through the whole business of debating it in detail, and nothing would have been saved. They had had recent experience of what might happen in a Grand Committee when there was determined opposition to the principle of a measure. The noble Lord the Member for Greenwich had shown that a Bill could be more effectively destroyed in Grand Committee where there was no closure, than it could be destroyed in Committee of the Whole House. He would refer the First Lord of the Treasury to the views he expressed in 1894; and, on that ground, he would suggest that the right hon. Gentleman was out of court in proposing to send this Bill to a Grand Committee. But that was not all. The First Lord of the Treasury again expressed his opinion on the subject, not, as on the former occasion, when he was in opposition, but when he was responsible for the conduct of business in this House. He would refer to an Answer given by the right hon. Gentleman to a Question on the 6th February, 1902. He was asked if he would provide facilities for the Deceased Wife's Sister Bill; and he replied—

> "Grand Committees were intended for Bills of great detail and of no great controversial character."

Then he went on to say that this was a Bill of no great detail but which excited very vehement feelings on both sides of the House and also in the country; feelings, however, which he did not share. Still the Prime Minister recognised that a Bill of great controversial character, which excited feeling in the country, ought not to be sent to a Grand Committee. It could not be suggested that the Prime Minister would put forward such an argument as that because of the mere expediency of the moment, and without any real subtantial belief in the principle he was stating. He would suggest to the Prime Minister that in the view he then stated he was genuinely expressing his opinion as to the principle on which a controversial Bill should or should not be sent to a Grand Committee. That was the right hon. Gentleman's opinion two years ago. Had he changed his opinion now; and, if so, would he give the House the reason why? He submitted that unless the right hon. Gentleman could give the House satisfactory reasons for his change of mind he ought not to press this Motion. If he did press the Motion, and did not give any satisfactory reasons, they would be forced to the conclusion that the Prime Minister, in the conduct of business in this House, was occasionally driven to use various arguments for the purposes of expediency, and not to express his genuine feelings as to what was desirable.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee) said he was glad the Prime Minister was present for two reasons. He thought, at this stage of the debate, they were entitled to the leadership of the Leader of the House. This was not a Departmental matter to be left to the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill. It was a question of the highest importance—namely, the principle on which the House should delegate its business to its own Committees. On a former occasion, the Prime Minister laid down what he believed to be the correct rule for the guidance of the House in such cases as this. No allusion had been made to the rule laid down by the Prime Minister in 1895, when this question was elaborately discussed in connection with the proposal to refer a certain class of business to the Scottish Standing Committee. The Scottish Standing Committee was treated as an ordinary Grand Committee, and the rule which the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury then laid down as Leader of the Opposition was in terms applied to all Grand Committees. The right hon. Gentleman then said—

> "While I express general concurrence with the views of my right hon. friend the Member for Bodmin, I repeat that neither his plan nor any plan is possible, if once controversial Bills are to be referred to these Grand Committees. Would the Government dare to refer to an English Committee reflecting the value of opinion in this House the discussion of such a measure as the Local Veto Bill. I do not think so. It would knock the Committee to pieces and discredit the whole system of Grand Committees."

The right hon. Gentleman went on to say—

> "How are we to distinguish between controversial and non-controversial measures?"

and proceeded to give an example in the Crofters Bill, and asked whether that was a Bill that should be sent before a Grand Committee. Yet the Crofters Bill of 1895 passed its First Reading without opposition and almost without debate. It was between the First and Second Reading that the right hon. Gentleman took objection to its being sent to a Grand Committee. But that measure passed its Second Reading without a division. He invited the right hon. Gentleman to explain to the House now, how he could in the year 1904 propose to refer such a Bill as that now under discussion, approved as it had been, to a Grand Committee when he refused to allow a Bill which had passed through its intermediate stages to go to a Grand Committee in 1895. As this was the last occasion upon which the right hon. Gentleman laid down so elaborately this principle he would quote one more sentence. The right hon. Gentleman said:—

> "I have no objection . . . to the setting up of any number of Grand Committees provided you do not interfere with the general work of this House and no controversial business is submitted to them. Till those conditions are fulfilled I shall look with suspicion upon and I shall oppose any proposal for dealing in the manner suggested by the Government with this vast issue. I beg hon. Members who are interested in the work of this House and are anxious for its future success to watch with great suspicion the beginning of a movement which, unless safeguarded at every turn, may end in bringing the whole machinery of Grand Committees into hopeless disrepute."

It was impossible to reconcile the speech of the right hon. Gentleman on that occasion with the line he now desired to pursue, and he respectfully asked him to explain what had taken place since, what difference had there been, to justify him in taking the action he proposed.

MR. RUNCIMAN (Dewsbury) spoke of the Bill as a most important measure, in that it affected the interests of the largest seaports, interfered with the immigration regulations and plunged into matters of international policy of the very gravest kind. Although Clause 8 provided that the Home Secretary should have due regard to any obligations and treaties which already existed, the Bill would involve great risks. They had known international troubles to spring from smaller matters in the past. To his mind the measure was not one which ought to be referred to a Grand Committee; it should be dealt with in Committee of the Whole House. The Bill really covered such immense interests that he doubted whether the Grand Committee on Law was really equipped to deal with it. On a former occasion the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister had argued that the reference of controversial Bills to Grand Committees would knock the whole system to pieces. How could he reconcile his declaration on that occasion to his present attitude? He (Mr. Runciman) was opposed to the Bill going to the Grand Committee on Law, for one reason, because it dealt with matters which ought only to be dealt with in Committee of the Whole House; and, for another, because he had so much respect for the work of the Grand Committees that he felt they should not have work cast upon them which was likely to bring them into disrepute.

*Mr. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe) expressed the opinion that they were entitled to the presence of the right hon. Gentleman on an occasion of this importance, and said it was very unusual, unless he was occupied with very high work outside, for the Leader of the House when his words had been quoted at such length to absent himself in this way. All who had listened to this interesting discussion with an open mind must come to two conclusions. First, that they must be very careful indeed as to what Bills were sent to the Committees upstairs, and second, that this Bill was a most unsuitable one to send to a Grand Committee. He had recently read the Bill again and all the Amendments, and he was aghast when he found it was intended to send it to a Grand Committee. This House ought to retain within its hands all Bills raising great issues of public policy. Although, as had been seen that afternoon, there were Members wholly opposed to the system of Grand Committees he held strongly that they were very useful portions of the machinery of the House. His opinion was that more useful portions of their machinery did not exist than these Committees if properly used, but that nothing that raised great political issues should go before them. Whether or not a Bill was contentious depended not upon the number of clauses it contained, but upon the contents of those clauses. He remembered a few years ago a long and complicated measure dealing with railway rates being sent to a Grand Committee. There was no difference as to principle, but the Bill involved a great mass of detail. The Grand Committee was an admirable tribunal for dealing with such a measure; it was considered by gentlemen possessing technical knowledge and skill, and the proposals were satisfactorily threshed out. But too many Bills of a different nature—Bills short, it might be, but raising vital matters and warm controversy—had been sent to Grand Committees of recent years. Further the Leader of the House was responsible, and the result was that the time of those Committees had been largely wasted. There had been sometimes a difficulty even in securing a quorum, so certain was it that the Bill would go no further. He mentioned that fact to show the injury that was being done to the most efficient instrument in the procedure of Parliament for the promotion of legislation. Of Bills of a particular kind he desired to see more sent to Grand Committees, but he thought that the Home Secretary, if he bore in mind his own experience in Grand Committee and if he took to heart some of the statements which had been made or quoted in the course of the debate, would come to the conclusion that this Bill was not a suitable measure to be so dealt with.

Lord EDMUND FITZMAURICE (Wiltshire, Cricklade), speaking as one who had for several years acted as one of the Chairmen of the Grand Committee on Law, said that, while he had no desire to discuss the details of the Bill, he was placed in a position of some difficulty by reason of the fact that the Home Secretary himself had made the exceedingly important and almost controversial announcement that he intended to introduce important Amendments into the Bill. He would have liked a clearer statement on that matter. The right hon. Gentleman had stated that he had already made such a statement, but certainly he personally had not the faintest recollection of it.

*Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS: What I said was in reply to the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean on the Second Reading, with regard to political refugees, that it would be a point for the Committee.

Lord EDMUND FITZMAURICE said that was merely a generality of which the House would like to know the exact meaning. The proposal to refer this Bill to a Grand Committee was the last and the gravest step in a lengthy series of innovations which the present Government had been carrying out in the treatment of the Grand Committees. The ordinary course of business was that a Bill should be considered by a Committee of the Whole House, but the Standing Orders allowed an exception to be made under certain circumstances, and it was for those who proposed the exception to prove their case. The House had reason to complain of the shilly-shallying of the Government in having first of all led them to believe the Bill would be considered in Committee of the Whole House, and then in having delayed in making their choice between the Grand Committee on Law and the Grand Committee on Trade. As to the class of Bills that should be sent upstairs, having been a Member of the House in 1882 when these Committees were established, he knew perfectly well what were the intentions of Mr. Gladstone, of the framers of the Standing Orders, and of the authorities upon the business of the House. The original intention was that these Committees should consider measures connected with the improvement and consolidation of the law. The Statute Law Commissioners at that time were engaged in the great work of improving and consolidating large branches of the law, and it was supposed that that work would be facilitated by the establishment of these Committees, to whom would be sent Consolidation Bills involving much detail and requiring careful consideration, but arousing no controversy. That, however, was the one use to which the Government had never put these Committees. He was far from saying that none of the Bills which had been sent were proper Bills to go to the Grand Committee on Law, nor could he agree that no controversial Bills had ever gone to the Grand Committees. The present proposal was only an extension of bad precedent set when a most controversial liquor Bill was referred to a Grand Committee; the Bill consisted of seventeen lines, and there were seventeen pages of Amendments. The result of such a course of procedure was to discredit the Committee and to place in a most difficult position the Chairman, who naturally could not claim the high authority vested in Mr. Speaker. In the case of the Deceased Wife's Sister Bill, the closure had constantly to be applied and the atmosphere of the Committee Room closely resembled that of the House when a great controversial Bill was under consideration. The clauses of the Aliens Bill bristled with controversial matters; the measure, as a whole, struck a deadly blow at the great right of asylum by which men flying from persecution, political, civil, or religious, had been able to take refuge in this country unmolested; and for these reasons he protested against the Bill being smuggled out of the House by a dishonest use of a procedure intended for totally different purposes.

*MR. NORMAN (Wolverhampton, S.) said it was admitted that the question of the propriety of the Bill going upstairs would be decided in each Member's mind by whether or not a Member desired the measure rapidly to pass into law, and that desire would naturally depend upon one's view of the Bill itself. Personally he had great sympathy with much that was in the Bill; but before he could do anything to expedite its passage he would require strong assurances with regard to the safeguarding of the right of political asylum, and that the reference should not be to an individual but to a Court of Summary Jurisdiction, as recommended by the Royal Commission, of the question of who should and who should not be admitted into the country. But the even more important matter of the time-honoured procedure of this House was involved, and after the speeches of the Leader of the Opposition and of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Fife, he felt that he could not for a moment contemplate voting for the Motion. If any further argument on that point were necessary, it would have been supplied by the absolutely conclusive extract from the speech of the Prime Minister read by the hon. Member for Dewsbury. The Bill was the Bill of the Government; the responsibility of finding adequate time for debate rested with them, and he could not assist them in laying aside responsibility for enabling the fullest and freest public discussion to take place.

MR. TENNANT (Berwickshire) agreed with the Home Secretary that the question under discussion was not as to which of the Grand Committees the Bill should be referred; the real question was whether or not this was a controversial measure. The Home Secretary had expressed his surprise that it should be so regarded. Apart altogether from the action of this House, officials representing the right hon. Gentleman's own Department had admitted that the matter was one of great, if not insurmountable, difficulty. Sir Kenelm Digby had stated that no more serious injury could be done to a public Department than to impose upon it duties it could not perform. The Bill contained provisions which the Home Office were to administer, and yet the man who knew more about that Department than probably any other human being had said that it was almost impossible for any public Department to administer those provisions. He desired to see the Grand Committees fostered and strengthened in every possible way; they had done excellent work in the past; but they would not be strengthened by having such Bills sent up to them. What constantly happened was that a minority of the Committee attended, members specially interested discussed the questions, and then when the mature judgment of the Committee had been expressed, a docile majority in the House of Commons was invoked, and the decisions of the Committee were reversed. If the Government would agree not to reverse any of the decisions of the Committee there might not be much to be said against the proposal, but they would not, and perhaps constitutionally could not, say anything of the kind. He submitted that the present occasion was one on which so great a responsibility should not be cast on the Grand Committee by withdrawing from the jurisdiction of the House so important and controversial a measure as the Aliens Bill.

*Mr. STUART SAMUEL (Tower Hamlets, Whitechapel) said whatever the decision of the House might be on the general question, it could not be denied that the balance of argument had been in favour of the opponents of the proposal to send this Bill to a Grand Committee. He was not surprised that the Prime Minister had fled on being bombarded with shot taken from his own arsenal; but it was a remarkable case that, with the exception of the hon. Member for South-West Manchester, not a single Member on the other side had supported the Home Secretary on the present occasion.

Mr. GALLOWAY: I am sure the hon. Member does not wish to misrepresent me; I did not support the Home Secretary.

*Mr. STUART SAMUEL said that he would, of course, acquit the hon. Member of having done such a thing. The Home Secretary had argued that the Bill was non-contentious, but if so there was every chance of its passing in the House itself, while if it were contentious it had no business to be referred to the Grand Committee. But it was news to be told that the Bill was uncontroversial, as in previous discussions considerable difference of opinion had been evinced with regard to the revolutionary proposals contained in the Bill. If the measure were sent upstairs it would still further curtail the opportunities afforded to Members of discussing measures affecting the interests of the people of the country, and he should vote against such a course being taken.

Mr. WINSTON CHURCHILL (Oldham) said he felt somewhat bewildered by the course the debate had taken. Last session considerable discussion took place on the proposal to send the Deceased Wife's Sister Bill to a Grand Committee. On that occasion, in common with the Prime Minister and many other Members on the Government side of the House, he felt very strongly that the Bill should not be so dealt with, and the Leader of the House laid it down very clearly that controversial Bills ought not to be sent upstairs so long as the procedure of this House and of the Grand Committees remained as at present. He could not remember that that view was shared by hon. Members on the Opposition side of the House, but he was glad to discover that right hon. Gentlemen had now apparently changed their opinion as to the functions of the Grand Committees and the class of measure that should be referred to them, and to recognise that the differences between the Opposition and himself were not so great as he had supposed. The Home Secretary was the only person he had heard describe this Bill as non-contentious. What was meant by a non-contentious measure? Was it a Bill which could not be contended against, or to which no objection could be taken? If so, surely it could not be said this Bill came within that category. It raised all kinds of bitter and angry feelings in various parts of the country; it brought up questions of prejudice and passion. Many loyal supporters of the Government objected to the Bill, and Lord Rothschild himself had introduced to the right hon. Gentleman a deputation which complained of the Bill in moderate but powerful terms. It was an abuse of language to describe the Bill as non-contentious, and nobody, except for Party purposes, would have made such a statement. He would not argue the principle of sending the Bill upstairs, as it seemed to be admitted that those who desired the Bill to pass would favour its reference to a Grand Committee, while those who objected to the Bill would oppose such a reference. He should like to ask one question on the matter, not of principle, but of practice. Did the Home Secretary really imagine he was facilitating the passage of this Bill by sending it to a Grand Committee, the machinery of which was unfitted to the conduct of controversial subjects? The right hon. Member for Wiltshire had said the Deceased Wife's Sister Bill was frequently closured in Grand Committee, but that was done only on one occasion. He understood that it had been ruled that the power of closure did not properly reside in the Chairman of such a Committee.

LORD EDMUND FITZMAURICE said it had been distinctly laid down that it did; the Standing Order stated that the procedure of these Committees was to be the same as that of Select Committees.

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL said he understood, at any rate, that the practice had been much discouraged by the Chairmen of Committees. They had objected last year to sending the Deceased Wife's Sister Bill to a Grand Committee, and had urged that it was not practical politics to do so; and the event showed that they were right. The present Bill bristled with questions of police, the liberty of the subject, race, and religion, and a multiplicity of detail, and, after all, detail was a matter of principle when a measure was wholly objected to. This Bill appeared to contain a sufficient number of clauses to make it an unpleasant, disagreeable, and ill-tempered operation in Grand Committee, and moreover, if it passed the Grand Committee the whole business might be gone over again on Report. He thought the proposal showed that the Government were not in earnest. He had long suspected it because there were forces at work in the Government Party against the measure. If the Government intended to carry it they need not propose to send it to a Committee where the ordinary machinery for closure by compartments was not at their disposal. He thought this Bill was intended to deal with certain constituencies in the East End of London, at the next election. He did not believe the Government expected to carry the Bill or even desired that it should eventually take its place on the Statute-book.

***MR. MOULTON** (Cornwall, Launceston) said his view was not only that the Bill should not be sent to a Grand Committee, but further that the House had a right to call on the Home Secretary not to press the Motion. There was a vast difference between legislation and procedure. The minority had no right to complain of the legislation that the Government tried to pass; they were entitled to oppose it, but they could not complain of a Government using its majority for the purposes of supporting its legislative proposals. But the case of procedure was wholly different. The Rules of Procedure existed mainly for the defence of the minority. They were settled in the interests of the House as a Legislative Body, so that whatever Party might be in power, the privileges of the House and all its Members in respect of debate and the examination and discussion of proposed legislation might be secure. If it was to be held that a vote of the House was sufficient to justify an abuse of procedure, then the Rules of Procedure were absolutely as though they were revoked, because a powerful Government could then just as much trample on the Rules of Procedure meant to protect the rights of the minority as they could pass a Bill to which their opponents objected. The Rules of Procedure were agreed to by the House generally in view of the possibility that in future years the Party then in power might be the Party in Opposition. Therefore they were framed to secure rights and liberties to those who would not be strong enough at the moment to insist upon their views. He did not hesitate to say, therefore, that it should be a point of personal honour with the members of the Government never to abuse the Rules of Procedure. It was not a question of whether a docile majority would support them, it was a much higher issue. The Government could always get a docile majority to cover everything, but they should never call upon that majority to enable them to abuse the rights of those who were not strong enough to protect them. The present case was clearly one in which these principles should be applied. It was admitted by all that it was not the intention of the Rules that every Bill should be capable of being sent to a Grand Committee, but only a particular class of Bills. What, then, was the class of Bills which the Rules proposed to allow to go to Grand Committees? The Home Secretary himself acknowledged that such Bills must be substantially non-contentious. Supposing the Home Secretary when this debate began firmly believed in his view that this was a non-contentious Bill, could he say that it was a non-contentious Bill at this moment? The right hon. Gentleman had heard arguments which showed that the questions which would arise were questions of deep principle and not merely of detail. It was impossible for the Home Secretary now to believe that this Bill was non-contentious; this debate had proved the contrary, and the Home Secretary, therefore, ought not, as a matter of personal honour, to proceed with the Motion.

*Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS moved that the Question be now put.

The Motion was not accepted.

Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN (Birmingham, W.): The question, of course, is whether a particular Bill ought to be submitted to a Grand Committee or discussed in Committee of the Whole House. The hon. and learned Member who has just sat down endeavoured to make that question a matter of personal honour to the Ministers concerned. That, however, is quite impossible and unnecessary; we are really discussing a question of the convenience of the House and the progress of public business rather than a matter of personal honour of Ministers. If the hon. and learned Gentleman contends that for the present Government to send a Bill, which is clearly a contentious Bill, to a Grand Committee is a derogation of their evident duty, what has he to say of that Government, which a short time ago he supported, which sent to a Grand Committee the Employers Liability Bill?

Mr. JOHN ELLIS: That was read a second and a third time without a division.

Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN: That has nothing to do with it.

Mr. MUNRO FERGUSON (Leith Burghs): And the Motion to send it to a Grand Committee was passed without a division.

Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I will put my view before the House, and I think I have some grounds for it. The hon. and learned Gentleman, as I say, supported a Government which sent the Employers Liability Bill to a Grand Committee. That Bill was one of the most contentious Bills which has ever been in this House during the time I have been here. We differed in regard to the whole principle of that measure. The views which we held in opposition to that measure were afterwards carried into effect in the Compensation for Workmen Bill. I am not entering into the merits, but to pretend that a Bill of that character was not contentious is perfectly absurd, and to state that such a Bill was allowed to pass the Second Reading has really nothing to do with the contention I am laying before the House. The question is whether the Opposition of that day was opposed to the Bill or not. The hon. Member for Oldham said that really this was a question of opinion founded on the merits of the Bill. If you approve of the Bill you vote for sending it to a Grand Committee; if you do not approve of the Bill you endeavour to keep it in the House, where you resort to the process of obstruction in the hope of destroying it. Of course the hon. Member for Oldham is a little inconsistent, for while he made that statement, in which I entirely concur, at the same time he declared that the sending of a Bill to the Grand Committee was the act of a Government which did not desire to see it passed. That is all very well as a piece of debating-society oratory, but there is absolutely no Member of the House who has had any acquaintance with its practical procedure who does not know perfectly well that the object of sending any Bill to a Grand Committee is to promote its progress, and see it passed. That is why the Government are sending this Bill to the Grand Committee, and hon. Gentlemen opposite are, in the existing state of things, perfectly justified in opposing it, just as we in turn would do when hon. Gentlemen opposite proposed legislation to which we object. I approve of this Bill, and therefore shall vote for it going to a Grand Committee. [OPPOSITION ironical laughter.] I would hope that everybody on both sides of the House were equally frank. Every Bill, almost without exception, proposed by a Government is a contentious Bill.

It so happens that I have had a good deal of experience of Grand Committees in the early stages. I was in the Cabinet which proposed them, and to me was given the charge of the first great Bill that was brought before such a Committee, viz., the Bankruptcy Bill. Mr. Gladstone never contended that his proposal for delegation was to be confined to non-contentious Bills, for if he had he would have been unable to send the Bankruptcy Bill to a Grand Committee. But undoubtedly what Mr. Gladstone did say was that, in the first instance, in carrying out his great experiment, he proposed to send only those Bills which were not contentious in the most distinctly partisan sense, where the whole of the Government supporters were on one side and the whole of the Opposition Party was on the other. The Bankruptcy Bill was a contentious measure. Some hon. Members approved of it and some did not, and the same thing might apply to this Bill. I think if this Bill goes to the Grand Committee it will be found that there are divisions of opinion on both sides of the House. But I wish to go back to those early days when Mr. Gladstone proposed his great scheme of Grand Committees. I assert, having been very intimately connected with the proposal, that Mr. Gladstone's object was to limit the operation of obstruction in regard to public measures, to quicken the progress of legislation, and that was to the advantage of every Party which was a progressive Party. I thought so then and I think so still. [Ironical OPPOSITION cheers.] We may dispute as to which side that title can now best be applied, but it appears to me that progress cannot be satisfactorily attained in legislation, in social reform, in all the work with which the House has to deal, unless we secure some measure of delegation. I am in favour, therefore, putting aside for a moment the question of the merits of this particular Bill, of a more general delegation to Committees of the House. We have worked the system experimentally, and, as I think, successfully, and I would be glad to see more contentious Bills referred to Grand Committees. If Grand Committees are properly chosen they are, in fact, microcosms of the House. We can have two or three, or even more, sitting at the same time, and we can therefore double or treble the work which the House may perform, and that, as I have said, is to the advantage of the most progressive Party in the House. I invite my hon. friends around me to accept that position, and, though hon. Members opposite are now contesting with us, I invite them to accept the same conclusion. Whatever is done in this respect is for the benefit, not of one Party alone, but of both Parties of the House. More and more the House is taking upon itself detailed work, more and more is expected of legislation, and it cannot perform its duties unless it carries this principle of delegation further than it has hitherto done. If it is alleged, as it has been alleged, that in these Committees there is not sufficient arrangement for dealing with obstruction, then I, for one, will be perfectly prepared to vote for such an alteration of the Rules as will give the

Chairmen of these Committees greater powers.

*SIR HENRY FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.): No doubt the right hon. Gentleman speaks with authority as to what was in Mr. Gladstone's mind when the appointment of Grand Committees was first proposed. I was in the House at that time and familiar with all the debates, but Mr. Gladstone never revealed to the House any ulterior intention similar to that which the right hon. Gentleman has alluded. I regret not only that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham was not present during the earlier portion of the debate when Mr. Gladstone's own words in connection with this matter of Grand Committees were read to the House, and also Mr. Gladstone's later utterances in the controversy which arose between him and the then Leader of the Opposition, the late Sir Stafford Northcote. I still more regret that the right hon. Gentleman did not have the opportunity of hearing quoted the views of the Prime Minister on the same subject. These quotations showed that the Prime Minister had exhibited determined opposition session after session, both before and since he became Prime Minister, to sending such Bills to a Grand Committee. The right hon. Gentleman said that he viewed this practice with growing alarm, and that the House was being placed in a false position by sending Bills upstairs which ought to be considered in Committee of the Whole House. In fact, the Prime Minister has committed himself to every argument which has been used in this debate against sending this particular Bill to a Grand Committee. But having heard these quotations from his own statements the Prime Minister left the House and has not taken any further notice of the debate. I agree with the right hon. Gentleman who has just spoken, that if this House is to go on attempting to perform the enormous mass of work now thrown on its shoulders without any delegation or devolution it cannot carry the legislation of the country into effect. But I do not think the Grand Committee, as at present constituted, would prove the most suitable instrument for that purpose. I remember I had the honour of sitting on the Grand Committee on the Bankruptcy Bill, about which there was no controversy as to principle—none whatever. The controversy was as to details. Every man in the House of Commons wanted an effective Bill passed. The right hon. Gentleman introduced a very good Bill into the House and carried it through Grand Committee with consummate ability, and with his great persuasive power he got through all the difficulties of the Report stage. We have heard about Bills which were sent to the Grand Committee which were not suitable for that tribunal. The hon. Member for Oldham alluded to one very well-known Bill in which he took a distinguished part, along with the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Oxford University. They formed a trio and brought the Committee to a complete standstill. I do not think that in any division they mustered more than seven supporters, but the Committee gave the Bill up in despair and the Bill was wrecked in the Grand Committee by the obstruction pure and simple of a very small minority. That is why the noble Lord and the hon. Member who have occupied the position of Chairmen of Grand Committees have told the House that this is not an efficient, workable instrument. I do not know what the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary expects when he has carried his Motion to take this Bill upstairs. How long does he expect that this Committee will last, and when will all controversy disappear? And then the whole debates will have to be gone over again on the Report stage. The Grand Committee is not an instrument for legislation which the Government desires to see pass. It is only an instrument for legislation which the House desires to see passed, and regarding which the House says that the details can be much better thrashed out upstairs. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham says that there ought to be delegation and devolution, and I agree that if the House intelligently considered the whole of this question they would be able to contrive some scheme for dealing with it, but it will not be the present scheme. My noble friend behind me quoted a precedent in which the closure was put in force on an important Bill.

But that was put in force on the theory that the proceedings in a Standing Committee were conducted in the same way as the proceedings in a Select Committee, and that a Select Committee had power to regulate its own procedure. How that would work in a protracted series of debates I have my doubts. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham admits that this is a Bill the principle of which is contested. That principle involves most serious questions of an international character and of an administrative character, questions as to the powers of the Executive and the power of dealing with foreign countries, and questions concerning conflicting trades and varying interests, and, therefore, I think that the House is the only tribunal to settle the details of such a measure. I am quite sure it will be impossible to avoid full discussion in the House. If I desired to see this Bill passed, which I do not, I should certainly not support the Motion to refer it to a Standing Committee, because I believe that the whole of the time and labour will be thrown away.

MR. DALZIEL said that the House had great reason to complain of the attitude of the Government with regard to this debate. In a debate of this character, the presence and leadership of the Prime Minister should be given to it. What was the position in which the House found itself? The Home Secretary proposed to refer this Bill to a Grand Committee, and all the debate which followed was treated with the most absolute contempt. That was not the way in which the Government ought to treat the House of Commons in a matter of this kind. For good or evil, he contended that they were to-day sanctioning a proposal which went to the very root of procedure in this House. It would create a revolution in the practice of the House if this Bill were sent to a Grand Committee. The Government having made up their minds, it mattered not whether they, on that side, were unanimous; not the slightest heed was paid to what they said. If the House passed the Motion, what was to prevent the Government coming to the House with the most contentious Bill they could possibly bring forward; and with their solid majority referring it to a Grand Committee? There might be a good deal to be said for the proposal if this House was expected to pass all the legislation which Governments expected it to pass; but it was a departure which ought not to be treated as it was treated by the Government, and ought not to be settled without full and careful inquiry. It was not a matter to be decided on the Aliens Bill. It went far beyond that to a matter of principle, and might be used for any Bill that could possibly be introduced. They were now about to establish a precedent which would give future Governments the right to send the most contentious Bills upstairs. Nay, more, it would give them the right to take away control from this House, because there would be nothing to prevent a Government, having sent a Bill upstairs, from refusing to accept a single Amendment, leaving the House only the Third Reading stage on which to protest. Such a departure ought not to be carried out without the most complete consideration, and after its almost unanimous acceptance by the House.

This was to his mind a new and a most dangerous proposal. During the afternoon three Bills had been mentioned as instances. The first was the Deceased Wife's Sister Bill; but that had no analogy to the question under discussion. It was a private Member's Bill; and there was the greatest difference in this matter between a private Member's Bill and a Government Bill, because, rightly or wrongly, it was the accepted custom of the House to recognise that if a private Member got a Second Reading for his Bill he ought to have all the advantages which the House, as it affected private Members, could give him. He maintained that the only possibility of passing a private Member's Bill was to send it upstairs. With Government Bills the conditions were altogether different. They were masters of the time of the House; they had the remainder of the session in front of them; and the arguments which would weigh as regarded private Members' Bills did not weigh as regarded Government Bills. Then the Employers Liability Bill was mentioned. It was admitted by every test that could be brought to bear on it that it was not a contentions Bill. If it had been, the House would not have passed its Second Reading without a division. That Bill, therefore, could not be quoted as a precedent. Then there was the most curious suggestion of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham that the Bankruptcy Bill was a contentious Bill. It was very hard to follow the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham. What did he say about the Bankruptcy Bill a few years ago. He said—

> "It raised absolutely no Party or controversial question, no contentious question whatever, in the ordinary sense of the word."

He would put the right hon. Gentleman of a few years ago against the right hon. Gentleman of to-day, and leave them to settle it between them. He maintained that the Bankruptcy Bill, according to its author, was not a contentious Bill. If the Motion were passed they would be making it possible for any future Government to send any Bill they pleased to a Grand Committee. Here was a most extraordinary situation as far as the Government were concerned. The Home Secretary's case for sending the Bill to the Grand Committee was that it was not contentious; the case of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham, the only Member who supported the Motion, was that it was contentious. He thought the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham ought to be more fully consulted beforehand in reference to those matters. Then the time of the House would not be wasted. He thought the. silence of the Government during the debate had been brazen. He should like to know what the Under-Secretary for the Home Department had to say in that matter. With the courage which characterised him, he might throw over both the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham and the chief of his Department and give new reasons why this departure should be made.

There were other reasons which had a very important bearing on this matter. The hours of the House had been changed, and Grand Committees now sat simultaneously with this House. There might be ten or eighty Members engaged upstairs in a very important debate; and the House might at the same time be engaged in a discussion also. In that way the influence of the House would be divided; and that was a very important point indeed. He thought the House ought to take into consideration the question whether the Grand Committees should not rise when the Speaker took the Chair. It was obviously impossible that the House should have full authority so long as a great proportion of its Members were engaged upstairs discussing important measures. The proposal of the Government was an all-advised and bad proposal. It was not supported by any one practically, except by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham, who supported it for the very reason that the Home Secretary opposed it. No Member of the rank and file of the Party opposite supported it. They saw further than the Home Secretary; and they saw the danger of a Liberal Government sending any measure they liked upstairs. It was a mistaken and a dangerous proposal; there was no precedent to justify it, and he ventured very humbly to protest against it.

Mr. WHITLEY (Halifax) said the most astonishing fact in the debate was the extraordinary absence of the Prime Minister. At the very moment the House expected him to give guidance in the matter, and after his own utterances had been quoted from the Front Opposition Bench, the right hon. Gentleman left the House. Surely they had a right to claim that the Prime Minister should not treat the House in such a manner as that. That was not the way to get business through. He had read the speeches on the subject on a previous occasion of the Prime Minister, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham, and the hon. Gentleman the Under-Secretary for the Home Department. It was an insult to the House when he heard his own words being read across the Table that the right hon. Gentleman should have immediately left the House and should not come back to tell the House how he proposed to reconcile those words with the action he proposed to take. It would be a proper thing for the House to decline to allow this matter to go forward until the right hon. Gentleman had given some explanation.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT (Monmouthshire, W.): I shall only detain the House a few moments. I have listened to this debate, and in my opinion there is nothing more important for this House than that it should be governed by the highest authority and settled principles. This is a question upon which the House has a right to expect the guidance and opinion of its Leader. The whole character of the House of Commons in its conduct of this Bill—I will go further and say the character of the House of Commons in the opinion of the country—and I deeply regret to be obliged to say it—is not what it has been in former times. That ought to make us the more careful in matters of this kind to act with the greatest deliberation and under proper authority. I do not want to place my opinion of the merits of this Bill before the House on this occasion, but I confess, so far as I can judge, this is a most controversial Bill, involving great constitutional principles. It is a Bill stated by the right hon. Member for West Birmingham to be contentious, and the right hon. Gentleman failed to prove that any Bills of this kind had been sent to a Committee upstairs. Therefore if this Bill is to be sent to a Grand Committee it is in violation, as I understand it, of all the precedents that have governed the action of this House in cases of this kind. [At this point Mr. A. J. BALFOUR entered the House.] I am exceedingly glad the right hon. Gentleman has come into the House, because I am sure we shall now hear from him how he reconciles his proposal to send this Bill, which is a highly contentious Bill — contentious in a marked degree — involving constitutional principles which hitherto have been rigidly observed, with the language he used in 1895. The right hon. Gentleman will tell the House how his intention is consistent with the principles, quoted several times in the House, which he laid down to govern this subject.

*MR. J. A. PEASE (Essex, Saffron Walden) said the Home Secretary had justified sending this Bill to a Grand Committee on the ground that this Bill was a non-contentious measure, and in proof of his statement had called attention to the fact that it had passed its Second Reading by a majority of 124. Nearly all the Opposition went into the Lobby against the Government, and considering the fact that in the absence of over thirty Irish National representatives, always away unpaired, the Party majority in favour of the Government was 140, it was absurd for the Home Secretary to claim that this Bill was non-contentious. But the right hon. Gentleman's statement had been refuted by the right hon. Member for West Birmingham, who came down and said that this was a contentious Bill. He instanced as a precedent for its being sent to a Grand Committee the Employers Liability Bill, which he said was also a contentious measure. The Employers Liability Bill was not contentious in the least degree. If the ex-Colonial Secretary had only listened to the debate, he would have heard the right hon. Member for Fife's statement. He had pointed out the fact that the Employers Liability Bill was not even opposed on its Second Reading, and that the only contentious portion was the one clause which dealt with the power to contract out. This was the most contentious Bill which it ever had been proposed to send to a Grand Committee. One reason why a contentious Bill should not go before a Grand Committee was that the House might lose the power of making any amendment to it, for if it was not amended in its passage through the Committee it could not be amended on Report.

*MR. SPEAKER said under the new Rules that was not so. Such a Bill could now be amended on Report.

*MR. J. A. PEASE said he was glad that that change had been made. As an illustration of the necessity of this Bill going before a Committee of the Whole House, he mentioned that at two general elections a person had opposed him wholly and solely on the ground that he might oppose the admission of aliens to this country. During those elections, an enormous number of points were raised, affecting race, religion, and trade; there was aroused strong passion as well as the sentiment connected with the liberty afforded to political refugees, and from his experience he could assert, the questions raised by the Bill were of far-reaching importance such as the whole electorate were entitled to have a voice in through their representatives sitting in Committee of the Whole House. It was a matter of very great interest to the community at large and was of a most contentious character, and the use of the Grand Committee ought not to be abused by having a Bill of this kind sent before it.

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton) said he had no prejudice against this Bill, and that was shown by his voting for its Second Reading. He had voted for it because he thought there should be some general regulations laid down with regard to the admission of aliens into this country, but he did not agree with the whole of the provisions of the Bill, and had voted for the Second Reading because he thought a Bill of this importance would come before a Committee of the Whole House and that he and those who were of his opinion would have many opportunities during the Committee stage to approve or reject those parts of the Bill with which they did or did not agree. The right hon. Member for West Birmingham had characterised the Bill as a contentious measure, in proof of which he had said there was considerable cross-voting upon the Second Reading. His recollection was that there was not very much cross-voting, and, unless he was greatly mistaken, there were not more than four on the Opposition side who voted for it, and half-a-dozen on the Unionist side who voted against it; and the six who voted against it on the Government side of the House had special reasons for so doing. Never had there been a more fair Party division upon any subject. Hon. Gentlemen on the Unionist side of the House were in favour of very strict regulations with regard to aliens, and hon. Gentlemen on the Opposition side were opposed to any legislation on the subject, and in particular they referred to political crime. The Bill was essentially a controversial one, and he certainly did think, when he supported the Government on the Second Reading under those circumstances, that he was being unfairly treated when he was told, having voted for the Bill, that a particular action should be taken in regard to it, and that it should be taken before a Grand Committee upstairs. The Bill would take some time in Committee upstairs, because obstruction was much easier in Committee, and if he had one stalwart with him he would undertake to say that the Home Secretary would have to give up all other occupations to pass this Bill through the Committee. The Bill was essentially controversial, and the only reason it was being sent upstairs was that the Government had made such a mess of things that their business was in arrears, and there was not time to get through the House the measures they desired to pass. Personally he would prefer the Aliens Bill to be pushed through than the measure intended to bribe the brewers to vote for the Party opposite at the next election. Had it not been for the miserable Licensing Bill, there would have been plenty of time to deal with the Aliens Bill without sending it upstairs. He was glad to see the Prime Minister back in his place, though he did not expect much light and leading from him when he spoke. The Prime Minister's mind was so much greater than his own that he could not follow the right hon. Gentleman into the metaphysical clouds which he so much frequented. But he did admire the Prime Minister's skill of fence in debate. The right hon. Gentleman was now in a very tight place, and it would be interesting to see how he would get out of it. In 1895 the right hon. Gentleman said—

> "I have watched with growing alarm and disquietude the way in which the Government, session after session, have shown an inclination to refer to Grand Committees Bills of a more and more controversial character."

He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would endeavour to reconcile that statement with the Motion now before the House.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I understand that hon. Gentlemen have been largely occupied in what is, at the worst, the innocent, and, at the best, I hope the profitable occupation of reading up my old speeches upon the subject of references to Grand Committees, and the hon. Gentleman who has just sat down has challenged me in regard to a statement that I made in 1895. I have not the same eagerness to read my speeches which seems to possess hon. Gentlemen opposite, and I do not recollect the occasions on which these various statements were delivered, but I can easily tell the House my views upon this matter. When Grand Committees were first started by Mr. Gladstone, in 1882, I regarded them with extreme suspicion. I did not like many changes that Mr. Gladstone then proposed. The closure was one of them, and the establishment of Grand Committees was another. The particular shape which those changes have since taken has been an alteration in form and not in substance, and, as the House knows, I have long come to the conclusion that it was absolutely impossible to get through our legislative business without the closure. I do not believe that any Government could do it, and certainly the last specimen of a Radical Government we had used the closure in a manner to which I objected, and to which, were I in opposition, I should doubtless object again. We have had power to apply the closure to particular debates, to clauses of Bills, and to Bills as a whole. It is extremely regrettable, but it is, I think, absolutely inevitable. With regard to my conversion to the system of Grand Committees, I admit that there are many classes of Bills which I should prefer to see discussed in this House, but I also feel that Mr. Gladstone was probably more far-seeing than I was when he said that if we were to go on at all there must be a large measure of devolution of the Committee business of this House to Committees upstairs. It is quite true that I have expressed the view that there are Bills which are so important and so controversial that they ought not to be sent upstairs, and I still hold that opinion. The Leader of the Opposition has admitted what is indeed obvious, that whether or not a Bill is controversial is, and must be, a matter of opinion. There will always be Bills on, or near, the border line of what ought, or ought not, to be sent upstairs, and I candidly admit that this Bill is near that border line. I do not deny that this is a Bill which, if circumstances were favourable, might reasonably be discussed in this House. There are Bills the details of which it would be obviously absurd to waste the time of the House in discussing, and which nobody would object to sending upstairs. I do not say that of this Bill. It might reasonably be said that this Bill might, with advantage, be discussed in this House, and it might also reasonably be said that it might be better discussed upstairs. But when a Bill is near the border line we shall, I think, find that those who want to advance Government business are those who think the Bill might, with some advantage, be sent upstairs, and those who want to obstruct Government business—if there are any—are those who take the opposite view. That division of opinion is, I think, precisely the division of opinion that now prevails in the House.

MR. GALLOWAY said he had objected to the Bill being sent upstairs.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I was not aware that my hon. friend had objected, but, broadly speaking, I think that is the division of opinion.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES said that he also objected.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: That rather confirms the statement that I made before. Let us be candid in the matter. Will anybody deny that that solid phalanx of hon. Members opposite have been moved by something more than the abstract desire that the principle of Grand Committees should not be forced a hair's-breadth beyond the point—I do not think they practised it—which, by a process of exegesis of their own, they extract from my previous utterances on the subject? The motive of hon. Gentlemen may be honourable and legitimate, but at all events it is plain. If this had been a Bill which clearly belonged to the category of controversial measures, of course it would be straining the Rules of the House to send it upstairs, but I do not think we are straining the Rules. If hon. Gentlemen opposite took a view that would make it possible to carry a reasonable modicum of legislation in the course of the session without sending the Bill upstairs, I should not greatly quarrel with hon. Gentlemen who object to its being so dealt with. But that is not the situation. The Opposition, who have the power in their hands, are determined that that modicum of legislation shall not be carried so far as they can prevent it. They do not deny it. They oppose this Motion because they do not want progress, and I support it because I do want progress. I have been accused of indulging in metaphysical oratory which nobody could understand——

MR. LABOUCHERE: I said which I could not understand.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am quite willing to accept the hon. Gentleman as the high water-mark of intelligence. At all events, I hope I have now reduced the matter to what everybody will deem to be a perfectly honest and fair statement of the case. Everybody may not agree with my conclusions, but they are simply these: that the Bill is one near the border line of Bills which ought not to go to Grand Committee; that those who wish to obstruct Government business in any way they can naturally wish to discuss the Bill in the House; and that those who want to promote Government business on the whole desire to send it upstairs. While I never would attempt to force what I regard as the constitutional privileges of this House, I do not think the Government are unduly forcing them when they deal in this manner with a Bill which, although it has excited some opposition, has been carried by a majority greater than the ordinary majorities the Government command in this House, and in which the only really difficult question is the question of political refugees, with which we have promised to deal in Committee. If the Committee upstairs will consent to deal with that question in a business-like spirit, I believe it will be better dealt with by them than it would be down here. I hope that the House, having debated this question at a length which somewhat astonishes me, will now consent to come to a decision on a question which I do not think involves the profound principle which hon. Members have read into it, but is really a question between those who wish to promote, and those who do not wish to promote, the progress of Government business.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 277; Noes, 187. (Division List No. 138.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, Augustus Hen. Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arnold-Forster, Rt.Hn.Hugh O
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt.Hn.Sir H.
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J.(Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir Mich. Hicks
Beckett, Ernest William
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Boulnois, Edmund
Bousfield, William Robert
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brown, Sir Alex. H. (Shropsh.)
Brymer, William Ernest
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A.(Glasgow
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt.Hn.J.(Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt Hn.J.A(Worc.
Chamberlayne, T. (S'thampton
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Rt. Hon. Sir John C. R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Davies, Sir H. D. (Chatham)
Denny, Colonel
Dewar, Sir T.R.(TowerHamlets
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dimsdale, Rt.Hn. Sir Joseph C.
Dorington, Rt. Hn. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt.Hn.Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants., W.
Fergusson, Rt.Hn.SirJ.(Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George N.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Forster, Henry William
Foster, P. S. (Warwick, S.W.)
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gordon, Hn.J.E.(Elgin&Nairn)
Gordon, Maj. E. (T'r Hamlets)
Gore, Hn.G.R.C.Ormsby-(Salop
Gore, Hon. S.F.Ormsby-(Linc.)
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert

Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E. W (B'rys Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Gunter, Sir Robert
Hain, Edward
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hamilton, Marq of (L'nd'nderry
Hardy, L. (Kent, Ashford)
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th
Haslam, Sir Alfred S
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heath, James (Staffords., N.W.
Heaton, John Henniker
Henderson, Sir A. (Staffords, W.
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Rt Hn. H (Somers't, E
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, Jn. (Kent, Faversham
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Hutton, John (Yorks., N.R.)
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
Knowles, Sir Lees
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Jos. (Monmouth)
Lawson, J. Grant (Yorks., N.R.
Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham)
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hon. W. (Bristol, S.)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William

Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W.
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Malcolm, Ian
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriesshire
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Middlemore, John Throgmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner Rt. Hn. Sir Frederick G.
Milvain, Thomas
Mitchell, William (Burnley)
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Moore, William
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute)
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington)
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Pym, C. Guy
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)

Robinson, Brooke
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Sir H. S. (Limehouse)
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. Edw. J
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G (Oxf'd Univ.
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. H (Sheffield
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.)
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh., N.)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland - Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith Rt. Hn. Herb. Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Austin, Sir John
Barlow, John Emmott

Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn
Brigg, John
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James

Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton

Cawley, Frederick
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Cremer, William Randal
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan)
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dillon, John
Dobbie, Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Elibank, Master of
Ellice, Capt E.C(SAndrw'sBghs
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Sir F. H. (Maidstone)
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Ffrench, Peter
Field, William
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hammond, John
Harcourt, Lewis V.(Rossendale
Harcourt, RtHn SirW(Monm'th
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutchinson, Dr. CharlesFredk.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, DavidBrynmor(Swansea)
Jones, William(Carnarvonshire
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kilbride, Denis
Kitson, Sir James
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Crae, George
K'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mellor, Rt. Hon. John William
Mitchell, Edw. (Fermanagh, N.)
Mooney, John J.
Morley, Rt. Hn. John(Montrose
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Doherty, William
O'Malley, William
Palmer, Sir CharlesM.(Durham)
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, John Wynford
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Reid, Sir R. Threshie(Dumfries
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L.(Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, Charles L.
Seely, Maj.J.E.B.(Isleof Wight)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Slack, John Bamford
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt.Hn.C.R(Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred(Merthyr)
Thomas, J A(Glamorgan, Gower
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Warner Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Chas. Henry (Hull, W.)
Wilson, Fred. W.(Norfolk, Mid.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Woodhouse, Sir J.T(Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. Causton.

ALIENS (EXPENSES).

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That it is expedient to authorise the payment, out of moneys to be provided by Parliament, of the salaries and remuneration of any persons employed, and of any Expenses incurred under any Act of the present session, to make provision with respect to the Immigration of Aliens, and other matters incidental thereto."—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.) said he thought it would be reasonable to ask that a Resolution of this kind should appear on the Paper so that they would know its precise provisions before they were asked to debate it. He supposed the object was to provide the expenses that might arise under the Aliens Bill.

It appeared to him that these might be very considerable, and if the Home Secretary would now give an indication of the amount and allow the Resolution to stand over it might be dealt with more quickly later on after hon. Members had had time to consider the objects for which the expenses were to be incurred. There was no hurry about this matter, because it would be some time before the expenses could be incurred. He understood that the expenses would include the payment, or the possible payment, of passages for aliens who were sent back, and also the expenses of the department which would be set up to carry out the provisions of the Bill. It was impossible that a Resolution of this kind could be submitted to the House without an estimate having been prepared. Probably at this moment the whole department existed in skeleton. The Committee ought to know the number to be engaged. They knew that in the case of some new Acts the expenses at the various ports were very considerable. The expenses in connection with the sugar tax would be trifling as compared with the machinery necessary to carry out the provisions of this Bill. The measure would involve the examination of every ship on which passengers were carried. There would be an examination of first-class as well as third-class passengers, and a very elaborate staff would be necessary. He noticed that in the Bill itself there was the safeguard that the expenses were to be such as were approved by the Treasury. But the House of Commons was interested in this matter as well as the Treasury, and he thought they ought to hear as much as the Home Secretary could tell them now in regard to the expenses under the Bill.

MR. WHITLEY (Halifax) objected to the Resolution passing without some explanation. The Committee had a blank cheque presented to them which they were asked to sign without the least indication of the expense that would attend the working of the Aliens Bill. A good deal depended upon the cost of working the measure. There ought to be an estimate of the number of officials to be appointed. After what had happened in recent years the Committee could put no faith in Treasury supervision. Treasury control had become quite a myth in latter days. He objected to the Resolution being brought on without any notice whatever. He was sure the Committee would be glad to hear anything the Home Secretary could tell them on the subject. The Resolution had been kept back until the moment it was to be proposed. He could not see why it did not appear on the Agenda Paper. An Agenda Paper was no value unless it contained the business to be done. Unless they got an accurate estimate they ought to move an Amendment and not give the Government a blank cheque.

MR. McKENNA (Monmouthshire, N.) said that this was in some respects the most important Vote to be carried in regard to the Bill. However bad the Bill might be in principle it did not matter whether it was carried in that House provided it was not carried out in the country. The Committee ought to know how many officials the Home Secretary was going to appoint, and what sort of men they would be. Were they to be ordinary Custom House officers, to whom would be entrusted the duty of inquiring into the character of immigrants, male and female, into their antecedents, the conditions under which they proposed to live in this country, and their secret history in the past? Was all this to be done by one individual, or would the right hon. Gentleman appoint a competent staff of gentlemen with considerable salaries—a staff who would be as qualified as Foreign Office clerks to carry out this delicate work. Upon the answer to this question depended the whole value of the Bill. The Committee could not discuss the principle of the measure until they knew how it was to be carried out. The expenses might come to £1,000,000 or £1,000, but the Committee had not the slightest indication of what they would be. He appealed to the right hon. Gentleman to say whether he intended to create an establishment that would ensure that the Bill would be properly carried out, and that he would have the means at his disposal to give effect to the will of Parliament. The staff must be adequate, otherwise it would be idle to carry the Bill. At the same time the staff should not be to expensive. The right hon. Gentleman ought to give a detailed statement to the Committee. Failing that, he hoped the Committee, in the interests of economy and good legislation, would not pass the Resolution.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) said that the whole estimate of the value of this Bill was how it was going to work. He had voted for the Second Reading, but he was bound to say that if he had thought it would have been referred to a Grand Committee he would not have done so. If was quite obvious that if the Bill was to come into operation the Home Office must have thought out what the expense of the working would be. Unless the Home Secretary could show the Committee that he had some accurate notion of the expense of working the Bill they must come to the conclusion that the Bill had been thrown on the House in a crude state, not properly thought out. He ventured to say that the Bill would require a great deal of amendment. In the course of the debate the Prime Minister had dwelt on the question of the right of asylum. That was an important element of the Bill, but there were other equally important matters which required considerable attention and amendment. What they wanted to know was in what direction the expenditure would take place, what sort or class of officers were to be put on to inspect and receive aliens. He was one of those who thought that a large number of aliens should not be allowed to come into this country, but the case of each individual should be considered. Had the Home Secretary considered how many of the inspectors should be women, because a very large number of these immigrants were women and children. He endorsed what had been said as to the necessity of placing the terms of the Resolution on the Paper before the Vote was discussed. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary would be able to assure the Committee that estimates of expenditure under the Bill had been carefully considered and prepared, and that this Bill was to be a workable measure and not one intended merely for public consumption. He was certain that the Bill in its present shape would do a considerable amount of mischief.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis) said that some exception had been taken to the form of the Motion and the manner in which it had been presented. The form had become almost ancient. He contended that the terms of the Resolution did not conform to the Standing Order. That was not the view now acted upon. The view now was that when a Minister gave notice that the House should resolve itself into Committee that that was what the Motion meant. If they were not to have the sum named on the first making of the Motion in the House, at any rate they ought to have it in their possession fully and in a written form when they came to consider the matter in Committee. He had again and again constantly pressed that without the slightest success. He could only act on what he understood the Motion to be as read from the Chair. This was not a Resolution for voting any sum of money. What it did was to authorise the Committee dealing with this Bill to deal with the clauses which involved the expenditure of money. That money would appear in the Votes and if considered excessive could be discussed. He was not contending that the system was satisfactory; but it was not a fact that this Motion was a Vote for a sum of money. It was only a Motion to authorise the Committee to deal with the clauses authorising the expenditure of money. Further, the clauses in the Bill would determine the amount of money to be spent. If the Committee chose to reject the money clauses then no money would be spent. He would strongly recommend to hon. Members opposite the study of Standing Order 71, and also the study of the construction to be placed upon it, so that they might know when a Minister made a Motion without notice that to-morrow or the day after, "The House do resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House," they should not be taken by surprise, but should debate the Motion and if necessary divide on it. He was ashamed to be teaching the Opposition their duty; but they did not seem to be aware of the opportunities they missed. It was when the Motion was orginally made that the Opposition should have discussed it. Of course, they knew nothing about it then; they did not appear to know much more about it now. The Home Secretary had, forsooth, been asked to give an exact estimate of the sum to be expended under the Bill. That was impossible, because the right hon. Gentleman did not know what clauses would be retained or rejected by that extraordinary and, as he thought, most unconstitutional body the Grand Committee. The charges might be enormous. The right hon. Gentleman could not tell within £500,000 what they might be. They might involve the charges of a war for all he could say; but those charges would have to be put on the Estimates, probably as a Vote of credit in the ordinary way. There was a very serious grievance connected with these money Estimates. They did not know beforehand the amount of the Vote; and when they came to the actual consideration of it, not as he was convinced was formerly the practice when the amount and conditions were known, they had to consider a Resolution which was merely read from the Chair, and the terms of which were not before the Committee in writing. That was an extreme abuse; and he hoped to live to see the day when a Government would be in office who would remedy it.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE (Bristol, E.) said that the hon. Gentleman had instructed the Government as to the proper way of laying their financial proposals before the House. He had also instructed the Opposition as to the way in which to obstruct those proposals. All he would say was that he would welcome the aid of the hon. Gentleman in pointing out the mistakes of the Government. He thought, however, that there was a flaw in the argument of the hon. Gentleman. The hon. Gentleman contended that if the Resolution were passed then the Committee upstairs would be forced to provide a sum for the working of the Act.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES said that the hon. Gentleman was entirely wrong. The passing of the Resolution would not in any way compel the Committee to pass any clause involving expenditure.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE said that there would be a moral obligation; and he assumed that a moral obligation had still some force even over hon. Gentlemen opposite. There was, however, a real difficulty in the matter. In America a large staff of inspectors were employed in carrying out the duties that would have to be carried out under this Bill; and it was a matter of notoriety that they had not been able to carry them out properly. Therefore, it seemed to him that with that experience before them it would be waste of money to make provision for a large staff of inspectors. It was notorious that alien immigration into the United States was on a scale which alien immigration into this country could not approach.

* THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member is really getting far from this Resolution. The Resolution simply authorises the Committee upstairs to consider the question; and the argument of the hon. Gentleman would be more appropriately addressed to the Committee.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE said he accepted the ruling of the Chair. He did, however, wish to emphasise the point made by his hon. friend the Member for Poplar that the inspecting staff should include a number of women. They were often asked to put their finger on certain details of expenditure which they considered unnecessary, and which ought to be discontinued. There were now a large number of Customs officers who were recently engaged for the purposes of the corn duty. Why should they not be utilised as inspectors? He thought this was a matter of practical utility and, therefore, he recommended it to the right hon. Gentleman.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee) expressed a hope that the Home Secretary had prepared the statement referred to by his hon. friend. Without this Resolution the Committee could not consider Clause 7 of the Bill. It was in order to lay a foundation for Clause 7 of the Bill that this Resolution was necessary. That was the clause that gave power to appoint officers and so provide the remuneration and salaries of the persons employed. He did not know what estimate was possible but it was very desirable that the Committee should know generally what the expenditure was likely to be. They were taking the first steps now towards the creation of a new Department of State, and they ought to know in general terms the number of officers to be appointed and the cost which these matters would entail.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's) said he might point out that there had been no change of procedure in this matter, the terms of the notice of Motion of these Resolutions had always been vague, as the hon. Member for King's Lynn had pointed out. It had never been the practice to put the specific terms upon the Paper; he had not been discourteous to the House in any way in adopting that form because it was the form of procedure which had marked debates of this character for many years. The hon. Member for Dundee had pressed him for an estimate of what the expenditure would amount to but it was quite impossible to give any detailed expenditure, at all events until the Bill had passed through the Committee and assumed its final form and until they knew what they would have to provide for when the Bill became law. The hon. Member opposite had asked whether it was intended to create a large department to carry out the proposals of this Bill. The proposal was that the central duties proposed by this Bill should be carried out by the experienced staff of the Home Office. There would be no fresh department to deal with the matter, and though some additional staff, e.g., of inspectors, might be necessary a very large number of the duties woud be performed by the officers of the Customs and the police. He could not make any statement to the House as to the figures nor as to the extra staff that would be required. It had not escaped his attention that it might be desirable if not absolutely necessary to have an increase of staff. It was quite impossible at this stage to say what the exact staff would be, but it was not the intention of the Government to have an expensive establishment, at all events at first, to carry out the provisions of the Bill. If he had the figures he would give them with pleasure, but it was impossible to say what the expenses would be.

MR. ASQUITH (Fifeshire, E.) said that the Committee had been gratified by the unexpected spectacle of the Secretary of State sheltering under the ample wing of the hon. Member for King's Lynn. Parliamentary necessities sometimes made strange bedfellows. The right hon. Gentleman was in this dilemna. Either the minimising estimate just given to the House as to the size of the staff to be employed was untrustworthy, or—and he was disposed to think this was the truth of the matter—the Bill would be a dead letter. Let the Committtee remember for what the right hon. Gentleman had to provide. Under the Bill every passenger arriving at any port of the United Kingdom was to be examined to discover whether he was an alien, whether he was likely to become a public charge, and whether he had any visible or probable means of support. That work could not be performed by a mere policeman or Customs officer in his leisure hours, or by a few gentlemen at the Home Office. To suppose it was a manifest absurdity. Either this Bill was intended for gallery purposes and was not intended to be put into practical operation, or it was a serious measure which the Government honestly desired to work effectively. In the latter event the provisions of the Bill could not be carried out without a large army of expensive officials. This was probably one of the most important aspects of the question and for himself, apart from the question of expense, he would vote against the Resolution on the ground that it was one and a necessary step in the course of legislation which he considered to be absolutely detrimental to the best interests of the country, as well as being against our constitutional practice.

MR. PERKS (Lincolnshire, Louth) said that all the Estimates of the Government were so wide of the mark that anything in the nature of exactness could hardly be expected from them. One reason why he hoped the Committee would reject this Motion was that the bottom would then be knocked out of this most offensive and unnecessary Bill.

In all the ports of the country at which large numbers of passengers were constantly arriving the Bill was viewed with considerable anxiety.

*THE CHAIRMAN said the hon. Member was approaching a discussion of the Bill itself; he must confine his remarks strictly to the authorisation to the Committee as set forth in the Resolution.

MR. PERKS submitted that the Resolution was more than an authorisation to the Committee. It was an authority to the Committee to discuss this question, but if the italicised portion of the Bill were struck out the Committee would have no jurisdiction to deal with this special class of expenditure. It was the duty of the Government to have formed some accurate estimate not merely of the extent but also of the nature of the expenditure. It was perfectly idle for the Home Secretary to expect business men to believe that the cost would be limited to the provision of a few extra clerks in the Home Office; the Bill would involve expenditure at all British ports, on vessels in transit, and even in foreign ports, but to this fact the right hon. Gentleman had not alluded at all. The Resolution referred to the expenses, not merely of the detention of objectionable characters, but of their conveyance back to the port of embarkation. The Committee were entitled to know the extent to which the hon. Gentleman expected to put these clauses into operation, for surely the Government had ascertained the number of immigrants who came into the country and formed an estimate as to what the cost of administration would be. He stated frankly, however, the one reason he would vote against the present proposal was that if it were rejected this offensive, unnecessary, and un-English Bill could not possibly pass.

MR. MCCRAE (Edinburgh, E.) complained that the Government was placing the Committee in a most extraordinary position. The Home Department would have to deal with some 80,000 aliens, and yet they were seriously told that the Government had no idea of the cost of the administration of the Act. The House was told to practise economy, but the Government was taking a leap in the dark with regard to expenditure which might be very considerable. He would like to know if the Treasury had been consulted as to the cost of administrating the Act? If they had not, there might be friction between that Department and the Home Office. The Government, whatever their views might be of the merits of the Bill, had evidently gone into this undertaking without any consideration of its financial aspects.

MR. RUNCIMAN (Dewsbury) said that the Home Secretary had placed the Committee in a most difficult situation. They had not the least idea from what he had said in a speech which should have been full of information whether he merely meant to add a typewriter or an office boy to his office at Whitehall, or whether he intended the Resolution and the clause in the Bill to cover establishments in every one of our great ports. He did not know whether the right hon. Gentleman had any experience whatever of the landing of passengers in the United Kingdom other than that he obtained in the main ports for proceeding to the Continent. But at the port of Hull there were tens of thousands of passengers who arrived every year and did not intend to settle in the United Kingdom, but who crossed to Liverpool and thence to the United States. Could they imagine that the present staff of Custom House officers there would be anything like adequate for the careful inspection of every one of those passengers? At the Tyne there were thousands of passengers coming in the same way, in Leith there were many, and the same remark applied to Aberdeen, the Thames Harwich, and many of the Western ports Every one of those ports would require a very largely increased staff, and the Home Secretary told them that they were to be under the Home Office. What an extraordinary confusion of Government Departments. Custom House officers were, so far as the duties went, under this Act to be under the Home Office. He could not imagine that the Department under whom those officers at present served was likely to bear the expenses of this measure—which were bound to be very great in the large ports—without grumbling, and he feared very much that the Estimates would go up every year. But, as a matter of fact, the expenses would apply to accommodation as well as to persons. They might have to provide for the erection of establishments—compounds possibly—where detained aliens might be lodged while they were under examination. They might have to establish in every one of the great ports where passengers arrived something similar to the Spinning House which he knew at Cambridge in his day.

* THE CHAIRMAN said the hon. Member's point might be relevant on the Committee stage of the clause, but it was not relevant on the present occasion.

MR. RUNCIMAN submitted with all deference that he was not objecting to the establishment of those houses, but was pointing out that the Home Office had made no estimate whatever as to the expenses which they were likely to incur. But not only did the clause apply to accommodation but it also applied to other expenses. Those expenses might mean the payment of the fares for the sending back of aliens to the Continent or wherever else they came from. The Home Secretary had no idea what expenditure was going to be incurred under the three heads he had mentioned. From the point of view of economy that was a most improper procedure, and the Home Secretary had shown in his speech that he did not know at all how far this Bill was likely to carry him. The truth was that it was not only a leap in the dark so far as our national traditions went, but a leap in the dark so far as expenditure went.

* MR. LEVY (Leicestershire, Loughborough) urged that the Government had no right to bring forward this Resolution without giving them some idea of what the expenses would be, because the Bill laid down clearly what would be the duties of the officers who would be appointed, and of the State Departments which undertook to carry out the Bill, and the necessary estimate might easily have been made. Undesirable aliens arrived at every port throughout the Kingdom and there would be no difficulty in the Government making an estimate of the number of people arriving in each port, and then arranging how many officers would be desirable to examine the people who arrived. If only certain ports were officered was it likely that criminal aliens would go to those particular ports? Certainly not. Unless they treated all ports alike it was clear that the Bill would work so as to exclude only those people whom they were told on the Second Reading it was not intended to keep out of the country. He did not think any Member who supported the Bill on the Second Reading would have done so had he thoroughly realised what the expenditure would be. It was useless to try and deceive themselves. The Bill, if it was carried out in the spirit in which it had been introduced into the House, must be administered so that in every port they would have to have people to examine every foreigner who landed, and all would agree that there would be some difficulty about that. Or was the Act to be worked so as merely to exclude the poor aliens and permit some of the most undesirable aliens, who were a scourge on society, to land on our shores freely, perhaps undesirable ladies who arrived at Dover, if they put plenty of rouge on their cheeks and wore fur cloaks, would be allowed to pass indiscriminately.

* THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member is really not addressing his remarks to the subject matter before the Committee. I must ask him to address himself to the Resolution under discussion.

MR. MILVAIN rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put;" but the Chairman withheld his assent, and declined then to put that Question.

And, it being half-past Seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

ALIENS [EXPENSES].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Motion made, and Question again proposed, "That it is expedient to authorise the payment, out of moneys to be provided by Parliament, of the salaries and remuneration of any persons employed and of any Expenses incurred under any Act of the present session, to make provision with respect to the Immigration of Aliens, and other matters incidental thereto."—(*Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*)

*MR. LEVY said prior to the adjournment of the House he had endeavoured to confine himself strictly to the financial aspect of the Bill, and he hoped he had been successful in so doing. This Bill they were told was drafted for the purpose of excluding undesirable aliens from this country. Undesirable aliens were of various types, hence it might be necessary in order to avoid complications to use a great deal of discrimination in carrying out the provisions of the Bill. Of course everyone would give the Government credit for a desire to carry it out without prejudice against any particular class. Therefore the responsibility upon those who would have to carry out its provisions would be very great, and the men whose duty it would be to carry out the provisions of the Act would have to be men of tact and judgment and they would have to receive adequate remuneration. This Resolution asked that this Committee should find all the money necessary for carrying out this Act. The Act would necessitate the appointment of officers for the purpose of examining all foreign passengers brought to any port in the United Kingdom before they were landed, and unless it was to be administered in a tentative manner, and only put into force where a certain class of aliens happened to land, it would have to be carried out in a complete manner and an officer or officers appointed to every port in the United Kingdom. Before they passed this measure into law the Committee wanted to know what it was going to cost. To say that it was impossible to make an estimate was not treating the House in a proper manner. Why, it might land this country into an expenditure of £500,000 annually. It was admitted that this Bill was not conceived in the desire to eliminate from the East End of London, and elsewhere in this country, the poor aliens who had been driven here out of their own country, and therefore the officers who would have to enforce this Act would have immense responsibility thrown upon them. They might bring this country into diplomatic conflict with foreign countries in a very short time. They would have to keep registers and records and would have to be responsible for returning to their own countries undesirable aliens who came to this. They might send some aliens, who were not undesirable, back to their own country and complications might arise when they got there, and this Bill might not only impose upon this country the expenditure of returning these persons to their own country, but of compelling them to land when they got there. At every port we should have to make arrangements for detaining these people. We should have to set up at each port a sort of compound. Let the Government ascertain what such a thing as that would cost them before they asked the Committee to pass this Resolution. They could not put up a ring fence and expect that these people would go into it. They would have to put up a series of buildings in which to house them, otherwise there would be apt to be trouble with the nations who sent aliens to this country. The Home Secretary, therefore, had no right to come down and ask the Committee to give them a blank cheque for a matter which must cost many thousands a year, in order that this Bill might work as it had been suggested it should work. If it was merely going to be worked in the interests of a few in the East End of London then it might cost very little, but if it was intended to keep all undesirable aliens out of this country then it would cost a very great deal indeed.

Mr. GALLOWAY (Manchester, S.W.) said he understood that the expenditure under this Bill would in the ordinary course come into the Estimates of next year, but he was one of those who viewed the probable expenditure with considerable alarm. The expenditure of this country was going up by leaps and bounds, and on occasion he had attempted to obtain pledges from Ministers that the expenditure of their Departments should not increase. In his opinion, they were entitled to ask those who were going to administer this Bill for some reasonable idea of the cost the country was going to be put to in this regard. The procedure which they were compelled to follow in all such matters as this was of a most unsatisfactory character. First, the House was bound to decide whether it would carry out a certain work or not, and, having decided that it would carry out the work, it then proceeded to count the cost. It was not the fault of any Government but the procedure laid down by the House itself. It was a very unfortunate thing, but it was the procedure they had to follow, and this was the first convenient opportunity that had been given to draw attention to it. As to the cost of working this Bill, it would have been much more satisfactory and business-like if the Government had been compelled, as all Governments should be when they brought in Bills of this kind, to affix at the end of the Bill an estimate of the cost of the working of it. If such a principle applied to Government Bills it should apply still more to private Bills, and he was certain that in many cases had there been an estimate of the cost annexed to the Bill that would have greatly facilitated the progress of many Bills introduced into this House. If this Bill was to become the law of the land it should be carried out with proper officers adequately paid—officers on whose services the country could depend. The whole of Clause 1, in his opinion, would mean extra cost. The cost of the staff and forms would be considerable. The Treasury was not a Department that was fond of giving its money away, and he was perfectly certain in his own mind that the Government had some sort of idea of what the Bill was going to cost, otherwise they would not have obtained the sanction of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. This was, therefore, the proper time to ask for some rough idea of the cost. Anxious as he was to see these aliens who caused such harm, as he thought, to our own working-class population kept out, he thought the cost of keeping them out should be within reason, and that the Committee ought to have some idea what it was going to be before they passed the Resolution. Could not the hon. Member give some idea of the extra staff which would be required to carry out the various sections of the Act? He knew it was difficult in estimating for work, the extent of which one could not see, to give a correct estimate of what it was going to cost, but every business firm had some rough idea before they started to do the work of what the cost was going to be, and this Committee ought to have some idea of the cost, if not of the number of officers that would be required in order that this Bill might be worked with advantage to the country.

***Sir FRANCIS POWELL** (Wigan) said he should not be in order at this stage in expressing satisfaction at the Government having introduced this Bill, but he hoped that it would meet with the sanction of the House of Commons that evening. Hon. Members who had taken part in the debate seemed to him to be too impatient in their desire to get an entire scheme. In a case of this kind when the Government were making a new departure, or even a new Department, they were entitled to considerable time in which to frame their scheme and to lay it before the House. It was only by slow degrees that any change of this kind could be carried out at all. Those who were old enough to remember the Factory Acts or the Mines Statutes would remember that it was only by slow degrees, step by step, that those Statutes were placed upon the Statute-book. No Government introducing a scheme of this kind could describe it at once in detail and give even an approximate estimate of the cost. The work must be experimental, and in this case more than ordinarily so, because it had to deal with more than one Department. The Local Government Board must play an important part under this Bill, because the sanitary conditions of these people would have to be investigated with great care. Another Department must come in which would have to deal with foreigners guilty of crime, or leading, or having been guilty of leading, immoral and disreputable lives. The carrying out of such provisions as these might involve communications with foreign Governments which must necessarily entail expense. No Government could foretell what staff would be required. It was only by experience, and possibly some failures, that the Government would know how best to deal with this difficulty. He certainly felt some surprise at the attitude of hon. Gentlemen opposite with reference to reform. He found that all reforms were good which they proposed, but reforms suggested by the Unionist or Conservative Party were liable to every kind of suspicion. He did not think that was a fair attitude for them to take in a case of this kind. They claimed to be men of ideas.

*THE CHAIRMAN: You are not discussing the Resolution before the Committee. You are discussing the Bill as a whole.

*SIR FRANCIS POWELL said he was sorry he had gone beyond the scope of the Resolution. He only wished to suggest that the Government should be allowed a fair opportunity of bringing before the House their plans for the machinery that would be essential to the carrying out of the Bill. The financial arrangements must come before the House in the form of Estimates in due season, and that would be the time to object to any proposal that might be made.

MR. MUNRO FERGUSON (Leith Burghs) said he approved generally of some legislation of the kind proposed. He understood the Home Secretary to say that the Government was unable to give any estimate of the cost of the machinery of the Bill. Would the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill undertake to give before the Committee stage an estimate of the cost of the administration. It was a point of considerable magnitude, and he thought they were entitled to some information on it.

MR. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs) said he thought the House would acquit the Home Secretary of having been guilty of any discourtesy in not placing the terms of the Resolution on the Paper. The criticisms in regard to the non-publication of the terms were intended to point out the extreme difficulty which hon. Members had in discussing this very important matter, when they only knew the actual terms from hearing the Resolution hurriedly read over by the Chairman. He hoped that in future Resolutions of this nature would be properly put on the Paper ,in order that they might know exactly what the Government were asking. It would probably considerably shorten the debate that took place. One point which had been established was that the Government had not given the slightest attention to what might be termed the financial side of the measure. It was quite clear that they had not consulted the Treasury, and now they asked the House by this Resolution to devolve on the Committee upstairs responsibility which properly belonged to themselves. That was an action which there had been no attempt to defend that night. The administration of this measure might cost thousands of pounds, and surely the right hon. Gentleman had had some estimate for his guidance. Was it to be £10,000, £20,000, or £30,000? They could not attach too much importance to the fact that without money this Bill would be completely inoperative, and they had to consider to what extent they were willing to give a blank cheque to the Committee upstairs and to the Treasury for the expenses which would be incurred in carrying out the measure. If they could not get an estimate from the Government he hoped that, at all events, they would be able before the debate closed to limit the power of the Committee upstairs and the Treasury as to the amount the working of the Bill would cost.

Referring to the provisions of the Bill which involved expenditure, he pointed out that captains were required to make proper returns of aliens on their ships, and that they were to be liable to a penalty of £100 for failure to comply with the Statute. In this connection a large staff of officials would be required at home and foreign ports, and he wished to know what sort of provision was going to be made in regard to that. A great deal of inquiry would be required into the character and antecedents of aliens who arrived in this country. The aliens were to make returns for two years after landing in order that the Government might know exactly where they were living. It would be necessary to have a huge staff of private inquiry agents to find out where aliens were living when they did not make returns, otherwise the Bill would be a dead letter. Had the Government formed any idea of the cost of that branch of the work? Then there was the question of the inspection of aliens on landing, both in regard to their physical and mental condition. The man at 30s. or £2 a week could not tell whether an alien who landed was mentally strong or weak. He would like to know what member of the Cabinet was going to be in charge of the test made of the mental capacity of aliens. It seemed to him that it would be necessary to have experts in lunacy haunting the docks in order to see whether the aliens came up to the test to be imposed by the Government. In any case they would require a large medical staff at all the ports, and that would cost a great deal of money indeed. Was there any estimate of what the cost would be? There were to be registers not only for the Government, but for the benefit of public, and that proposal opened up the possibility of immense expenditure. Had the Government formed any idea what that would cost? There were to be inquiries made in different districts as to overcrowding. Besides the work falling on the Home Office, the Local Government Board was to have a good deal to do with the matter, and he presumed also that the action they took would mean the expenditure of money. He could imagine that thousands of inquiries might have to be made in the course of a year, because the Bill provided that a common informer had only to write a postcard to the Home Office and an inquiry would take place as to whether the person referred to was liable to be dealt with under the Bill. That would cost a great deal of money. There was provision in the Bill for sending back aliens who were considered undesirable. He could see great difficulty in preventing them from landing. He could see also that it might lead to a grave state of things between this country and other countries. There was also the question of keeping the aliens during the time inquiries were taking place. Establishments would have to be provided for them, and it might be weeks before the inquiries were completed. All the time this country, which was blamed for its generosity towards aliens, would have to keep them at the expense of the ratepayers until proper information could be forthcoming. The Government did not realise the importance of their own Bill if they ignored the fact that all these things meant money if the Bill was to be of any use. In refusing to give an indication of the cost it was no answer at all to say that the Committee might alter the Bill and that a statement could not be given now. That was simply a form of evasion. What estimate had the Government formed on the basis of the Bill passing in its present form? The right hon. Gentleman who spoke early in the debate said it was difficult to form an estimate, but that was not a satisfactory answer to an important matter of this kind.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. WALTER LONG, Bristol, S.) hoped the Committee would now be allowed to come to a decision on this matter, which had been exhaustively debated. It was impossible for him to meet the demand of hon. Gentlemen opposite for some sort of an estimate, as the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy had put it, in any more precise way than had been stated by his right hon. friend the Home Secretary.

MR. DALZIEL: You have the official information.

MR. WALTER LONG said the Government believed that with the exception of a very small addition to the clerical staff the existing staff would be sufficient for the work which would be involved in the carrying out of the Bill. They might be mistaken, but to attempt to state in a precise figure the expenditure which would be incurred in giving effect to the provisions of the Bill would almost certainly be misleading. Some calculation would apparently satisfy the hon. Gentleman however fanciful.

MR. DALZIEL: I say it is the business of the Government to give an estimate. They are paid for it, they have a staff to do the work, and they ought to be able to form an estimate which is not fanciful at all.

MR. WALTER LONG said the hon. Gentleman stated that he did not care whether the estimate was £5,000 or £20,000. He had said that the Government believed that a small addition to the existing machinery would be sufficient, and if they were to give an estimate of the cost it might be misleading. The hon. Gentleman opposite had given a striking example of how easy it was to speak at length on a small subject. The Local Government Board had inspectors appointed for the purpose of making inquiries and the expenses incurred would be charged against the different parties. Consequently, the Board's share of the expense would be infinitesimal. The hon. Member for Leith Burghs asked whether the Government would make a further statement before the Committee stage. He was afraid that they would not be able to make any statement which would be trustworthy. Debates often took place in regard to Bills introduced by private Members, and he should like to know how many would have the slightest chance of passing if they were subjected to the kind of criticism to which this measure had been subjected. They did not then hear the constitutional arguments which had been so fully reiterated to-night. The Government had given the Committee as much information as was possible in the circumstances, and he could only repeat the statement of the Home Secretary that they believed the Bill could be effectively applied without much cost.

SIR WALTER FOSTER (Derbyshire, Ilkeston) said he had been quite alarmed to hear all the prognostications of the enormous expense to be incurred in the attempt to carry out the administration of this Bill. Surely whoever drafted the Bill must have had some idea in his mind as to what the expenditure would be, and, if the Government had gone into the question from an ordinary business point of view, they must have made a conjectural estimate of what the Bill would cost. In all this kind of work they had to look to whether the expenditure was not more than the benefit to be obtained. Were they to get a benefit from what the administration of this Bill would cost? The right hon. Gentleman said they would, and probably that might be the case, but still the Government ought to be prepared with an estimate of what it would cost. Would local machinery be required at the ports at which the immigrants were chiefly disembarked? Would there be special medical inspectors? Where and how were the aliens to be maintained when they arrived in this country? These were all points which must have been considered, and some estimate of their cost made. What he contended was, that it was not fair to the Committee, and not candid on the part of those responsible for the Bill, not to give the Committee this information. They had had examples in the past of measures which they were told would be very simple and inexpensive in their administration, but which had subsequently made large invasions on the public purse. In these days when all Parties professed to have a regard for economy, the Opposition were bound to raise their voices against extravagance, and demand information as to what amount of expenditure was to be incurred in working this Bill.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs) said he could hardly believe that the President of the Local Government Board was serious when he stated that it was impossible to form some kind of estimate of the expense of carrying this Bill into effect. It was perfectly well known to those who travelled in America that there were a large number of officials engaged in putting into operation the Aliens Exclusion Bill in that country, and the Government could have obtained through our Consuls information as to what it cost the American Government. The simple fact was that the Government were proceeding with this measure, as they had proceeded with every other, recklessly, haphazard, and without having thought how far-reaching it was. The President of the Local Government Board had come to the conclusion that with a few extra clerks for examining the physical condition of the immigrants, the Customs officers could do the rest of the work. He wondered whether the Government had read their own Bill. Clause 6 provided for prosecutions for a breach of the regulations. That meant employing lawyers. He knew something of lawyers himself, and their bills did not come to a trifle for additional clerical assistance. The right hon. Gentleman had dismissed the question of the cost of inquiries in crowded areas. His experience was that the official inspectors were hard-worked, and he did not believe that there was one who could have any spare time to make these inquiries. Therefore, there must be an additional staff of officials in the Local Government Board, and that could not be done for nothing. Then Clause 4 provided that aliens must not go into prohibited areas; that meant sending down officials from time to time to see whether there were aliens in these prohibited areas. The President of the Local Government Board thought that all they had got to do was to issue an Order and publish it in the *London Gazette*, which nobody ever saw, and which no alien could read. The Local Government Board, or some other Department, must from time to time inspect these areas to see whether there were aliens there, and whether it was done by the Local Government Board or Customs and Excise it must be paid for.

Mr. WALTER LONG said it would be done by the local authorities.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said he did not care who did it, but additional expense would be incurred.

Mr. WALTER LONG said the Committee were discussing a Resolution regarding expenditure out of the Exchequer, but the hon. Gentleman was discussing expenditure by the local authorities.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said supposing it was the police who made the inspection, would the right hon. Gentleman say that no part of that would fall on the Exchequer? If the number of police were increased to discharge this duty, that implied an increase of contributions from the Imperial Exchequer. All this showed that the right hon. Gentleman and the Government had really never gone into any estimate of the cost of administration of this Bill. This debate would answer some purpose, if it only showed the Government what their Bill really was. Surely every proposal of this sort was largely a question of cost. Was the object worth attaining, if in the process we ran up a bill of £100,000? There was one item the Government had never contemplated. They seemed to think that the only people who required examining would be the 8,000 aliens who came here to remain. But what about the 80,000 aliens who passed through this country? Were we going to accept the statement of these immigrants that they were going through to New York or elsewhere, or were we going to have a sort of train sealed in bond to convey them across Great Britain, and were we to have officials to see that these bonded aliens went on board ship for their passage across the Atlantic? When once a Bill of this sort had been passed, it would be necessary to see to these 80,000 aliens as well as to the 8,000 who remained. If these 80,000 aliens were to be medically and mentally examined all the mad doctors in the country would not be sufficient for the purpose. Moreover an examination was to be made into their moral condition as well, and their financial position for two years previous to their arrival in this country. It took three Official Receivers with large salaries to examine the financial position of 3,000 or 4,000 people in this country, but the Bill provided for the examination of the bank-books, ledgers, and other accounts of these 80,000 aliens. This really was a most useful Bill if it only showed what a perfectly preposterous thing the Government were capable of proposing to the House. The Government said that the cost would not be much beyond that of providing a little clerical assistance. Surely the House would not commit itself to all this mad enterprise by which bills would be run up to an unknown amount. To put the meaning of the statement of the President of the Board of Trade to the test, he moved to add to the Resolution the words "Not exceeding in any one year £5,000."

Amendment proposed—

"At the end of the Question, to add the words, 'but not exceeding in any one year five thousand pounds.'"—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

MR. WHITLEY said that the Committee had been pressing for a long time to have an estimate of the cost of the Bill, and the figures in the Amendment moved by his hon. friend were the actual figures given by the President of the Local Government Board.

MR. WALTER LONG said he had never committed himself to any figure like £5,000. What he said was, that the existing staff could do the work with some little clerical assistance.

MR. WHITLEY said that that proved the case that £5,000 would be more than enough for the few extra clerks. The Amendment went beyond the amount suggested by the Government to the Committee. He really thought that for the protection of the taxpayers they ought to put some limit to the expenditure to be incurred for the purposes of the Bill. He himself would put a higher limit than £5,000 if the Government were prepared to say what number of officials would be required. He trusted the Committee would support his hon. friend.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON said that they had pressed the Home Secretary and the President of the Local Government Board to give some estimate as to the cost of carrying out this Bill, with the principle of which he personally agreed; but the Government seemed to think that it was a sufficient answer to their inquiries that this was an official Bill. If it were an official Bill one would have thought that they would have gone into all matters of detail as to questions of cost in connection with it; but it now appeared that they had done nothing of the sort. If, as the right hon. Gentleman had said, the administration of the Bill would only involve the employment of a few clerks, then the Amendment of his hon. friend would be amply sufficient to cover that. He was sorry to say he was very suspicious as to the intention of the Government. He thought, with his hon. friend, that this was a "shop window" Bill. He believed the Government did not mean business, or they would have been able to give some estimate of the cost. Under these circumstances he should certainly support the Amendment. He thought the Committee had not been properly treated in regard to this matter, especially as this would be the last opportunity which the House would have to consider it. He believed that the supporters of the Bill on that side of the House had been jockeyed in regard to this question, and many of them would not have supported the Second Reading of the Bill had they known it was to be referred to a Grand Committee.

***THE CHAIRMAN** said that the hon. Gentleman was not entitled to refer on this Resolution to the Second Reading. He had already called the attention of the hon. Gentleman to the fact that he was out of order.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON said that at all events they were entitled to support this Amendment on the ground that they ought to limit the expenditure.

***SIR HENRY FOWLER** (Wolverhampton, E.) said that he would like to ask the Home Secretary a distinct question and he hoped he would receive a distinct answer. This was not a private Member's Bill. It was a Government Bill, and the Treasury was not in the habit of leaving these matters of finance in the position in which they were, if the Committee were to accept the observations of the right hon. Gentleman that no figures as to the cost of the administration of the Bill could be arrived at. He wished to know whether or not the Home Office had submitted to the Treasury an estimate of the probable cost of putting this Bill into operation, whether the Treasury did not discuss that estimate, and whether communications in black and white did not pass between the two offices in which the Treasury intimated that they would assent up to a certain figure per annum. The Committee ought to have some definite statement as to what that figure was.

*MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS said he had already stated that it had never been the practice of Parliament when Bills of this character were introduced to make a definite estimate or give any figures to the House, and to that answer he adhered. He would not have risen now except as a matter of courtesy to the right hon. Gentleman. He ventured to think that the debate had been carried on to an undue length. Resolutions of this sort on Bills of this character had never been debated at the same length in his experience. In regard to the other point raised by the right hon. Gentleman, he said that, of course, the expenditure under the Bill would be such as the Treasury would sanction, and communications had taken place with the Treasury, but he repeated that he was certainly not going to give any estimate until he knew to what portions of the Bill the House would assent.

*SIR HENRY FOWLER said that in order that the Committee might not be misled, unintentionally of course, by the Home Secretary, when he said that this question had been debated at undue length, he would recall to the memory of the right hon. Gentleman a very memorable debate which took place when the present Prime Minister was Chief Secretary for Ireland and proposed that an additional Under-Secretary should be appointed. The debate on the necessary Resolution was protracted, he thought, to two, if not three, sittings and the Opposition was so strong that the Government ultimately withdrew the proposal.

MR. TOULMIN (Bury, Lancashire) rose to continue the debate, when—

MR. SECRETARY AKERS-DOUGLAS rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 179; Noes, 123. (Division List, No. 139.).

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt.Hn.Hugh O
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt.Hn.Sir H.
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A.J.(Manch'r
Balfour, Rt.Hn.Gerald W.(Leeds
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir Mich. Hicks
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold. Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowlest, Lt.-Col. H.F(Middlesex
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt.Hn.J.A(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Denny, Colonel
Dewar, Sir T.R.(Tower Hamlets
Dickson, Charles Scott
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dorington, Rt.Hn. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt.Hn.Sir William Hart
Egerton Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants., W
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Fisher, William Hayes
Fitzroy, Hon.Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, PhilipS.(Warwick,S.W.)
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Gordon, Hn.J.E.(Elgin&Nairn)
Gore, Hn.G.R.C.Ormsby-(Salop
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E.W(B'rySEdm'nds
Greene, Henry D.(Shrewsbury)
Greene, W.Raymond (Cambs.)
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Hain, Edward
Hamilton, Marq of(L'nd'nderry
Hardy, Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Heath, Arthur Howard(Hanley
Heaton, John Henniker
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hope, J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Howard Jn. (Kent,Faversham
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W.(Salop.
Keswick, William
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawson, J. Grant (Yorks., N.R.
Lee Arthur H.(Hants., Fareham)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine

Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hon. W. (Bristol, S.)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis(Edinburgh W.
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell, W.J.H. (Dumfries-sh.
Milvain, Thomas
Moore, William
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrison, James Archibald
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. Graham(Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Pease, Herb. Pike (Darlington)
Peel, Hn. Wm Robert Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Plummer, Walter R.
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, Hon. M.W.(Stalybridge
Ridley, S. Forde(Bethnal Green
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G(Oxf'd Univ.
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Webb, Colonel William George
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W.H.(Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E.R.(Bath
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

Tellers for the Ayes—Sir Alexander Acand - Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Austin, Sir John
Bell, Richard
Boland, John
Brigg, John
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Cremer, William Randal
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan)
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dobbie, Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Fenwick, Charles
Ffrench, Peter
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, J. M. F.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hammond, John
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Helme, Norval Watson
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, William(Carnarvonshire
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kilbride, Denis
Langley, Batty
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lundon, W.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Crae, George
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mitchell, Edw.(Fermanagh, N.)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nolan, Col. John P.(Galway, N.)
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid.)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O'Malley, William
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Perks, Robert William
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Reid, Sir R. Threshie(Dumfries
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Shackleton, David James
Sheehy, David
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire
Slack, John Bamford
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R (Northants
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, D. Alfred (Merthyr)
Thomas, JA(Glamorgan, Gower
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wason, Jn. Cathcart (Orkney)
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Woodhouse, Sir J.T(Huddersf'd

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. William M'Arthur.

Question put accordingly, "That those words be there added."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 133; Noes, 187. (Division List No. 140).

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herb. Henry
Atherley-Jones, L
Austin, Sir John
Bell, Richard
Boland, John
Brigg, John
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Cremer, William Randal
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan)
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobbie, Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Fenwick, Charles
Ffrench, Peter
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herb. John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hammond, John
Harwood, George

Hayden, John Patrick
Helme, Norval Watson
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kilbride, Denis
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Leyland-Barratt, Francis
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lundon, W.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mitchell, Edw. (Fermanagh, N.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid.)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O'Malley, William
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Perks, Robert William
Pirie, Duncan V.

Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Shackleton, David James
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Slack, John Bamford
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R (Northants
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, D. Alfred (Merthyr)
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Jn. Cathcart (Orkney)
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Woodhouse, Sir J. T (Huddersf'd

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Lough and Mr. Runciman.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W. (Leeds
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir Mich. Hicks
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.

Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, Lt.-Col. H. F (Middlesex
Brassey, Albert
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. A (Worc
Chapman, Edward
Coates, Edward Feetham

Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Denny, Colonel
Dewar, Sir T. R. (Tower Hamlets

Dickson, Charles Scott
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dimsdale, Rt.Hn.Sir Joseph C
Dorington, Rt.Hn. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt.Hn.Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, P. S. (Warwick, S.W.)
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Gordon, Hn.J.E.(Elgin&Nairn)
Gore,Hn G.R.C.Ormsby-(Salop
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene,Sir E.W(B'rySEdm'nds
Greene, Henry D.(Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.)
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Hain, Edward
Hamilton,Marq of(L'nd'nderry
Hardy, L. (Kent, Ashford)
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F. Leverton(Tynem'th)
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Heath, Arthur Howard(Hanley
Heaton, John Henniker
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hobhouse,RtHn H(Somers't,E
Hope, J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Howard, Jn.(Kent, Faversham
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kennedy, Patrick James
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W.(Salop.
Keswick, William
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawson, J. Grant(Yorks., N.R.
Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham)
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hon. W. (Bristol, S.)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver,Sir Lewis(Edinburgh,W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell, W.J.H. (Dumfriessh.
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moore, William
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrison, James Archibald
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute)
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Pease, Herb. Pike (Darlington)
Peel, Hn.Wm.Robert Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Plummer, Walter R.
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, Hon.M.W.(Stalybridge
Ridley, S.Forde(Bethnal Green
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand
Spear, John Ward
Stanley Rt. Hon. Lord(Lancs.
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt.Hn.J.G(Oxf'dUniv)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt.Hn.Sir William H.
Webb, Colonel William George
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W.H.(Yorks.
Wodehouse, Rt.Hn. E.R.(Bath
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

Whereupon Mr. SECRETARY AKERS-DOUGLAS claimed, "That the main Question be now put."

Main Question put accordingly.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 192; Noes, 140. (Division List No. 141.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster,Rt.Hn.Hugh O
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt.Hn.Sir H.
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn.A.J.(Manch'r)
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G.W. (Leeds)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir Mich. Hicks
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles,Lt.-Col.H.F(Middlesex)
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish,V.C.W. (Derbyshire)
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain,Rt.Hn.J.A(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-

Denny, Colonel
Dewar, Sir T. R. (Tower Hamlets
Dickson, Charles Scott
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dimsdale, Rt. Hn. Sir Joseph C.
Dorington, Rt. Hn. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r)
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Fisher, William Hayes
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, P. S. (Warwick, S.W.)
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)
Gore, Hn. G. R. C. Ormsby-(Salop
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Sir E. W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Hain, Edward
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nderry
Hardy, L. (Kent, Ashford)
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heaton, John Henniker
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hobhouse, Rt Hn H (Somers't, E)
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Howard, Jno. (Kent, Faversham
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.)
Keswick, William
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawson, J. Grant (Yorks., N.R.
Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham)
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hon. W. (Bristol, S.)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh, W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.)
Milvain, Thomas
Mitchell, Edw. (Fermanagh, N.)
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moore, William
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrison, James Archibald
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute)
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Pease, Herb. Pike (Darlington)
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Plummer, Walter R.
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G (Oxf'd Univ.
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Webb, Colonel William George
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-und.-Lyne
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W. H. (Yorks.
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herb. Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Austin, Sir John
Bell, Richard
Boland, John
Brigg, John
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Cremer, William Randal
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan)
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobbie, Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Duncan, J. Hastings
Elibank, Master of
Ellice, Capt. E. C (S Andrw's Bghs
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Fenwick, Charles
Ffrench, Peter
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, J. M. F.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hammond, John
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Helme, Norval Watson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire)

Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kilbride, Denis
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M‘Crae, George
M‘Kenna, Reginald
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Newnes, Sir George
Nolan, Col-John P.(Galway,N.)
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid.)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)
O'Malley, William
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Perks, Robert William
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L.(Cleveland)
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight)
Shackleton, David James
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Slack, John Bamford
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt.Hn.C.R(Northants
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel(Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, D. Alfred (Merthyr)
Thomas,J A(Glamorgan,Gower
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Henry J.(York, W.R.)
Woodhouse,Sir J.T(Huddersf'd

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. William M‘Arthur.

Resolved, That it is expedient to authorise the payment, out of moneys to be provided by Parliament, of the salaries and remuneration of any persons employed and of any Expenses incurred under any Act of the present session, to make provision with respect to the Immigration of Aliens, and other matters incidental thereto.

Question put, "That the Chairman do report this Resolution to the House."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 192; Noes, 142. (Division List No. 142.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt.Hn.A.J.(Manch'r.)
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir Mich. Hicks
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, Lt.-Col.H.F(Middlesex
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, RtHn.J.A.(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Denny, Colonel
Dewar,Sir T.R.(Tower Hamlets
Dickson, Charles Scott
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dimsdale, Rt.Hn. Sir Joseph C.
Dorington, Rt.Hn.Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt Hn.Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants.,W.)
Fergusson,Rt.HnSir J.(Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Fisher, William Hayes
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, P. S. (Warwick, S.W.)
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Gordon, Hn.J.E.(Elgin&Nairn)
Gore,Hn G.R.C.Ormsby-(Salop
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene,Sir E.W(B'rySEdm'nds
Greene, Henry D.(Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Hain, Edward
Hamilton,Marq of(L'nd'nderry
Hardy, L. (Kent, Ashford)
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard(Hanley
Heaton, John Henniker

Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Rt Hn. H(Somers't, E
Hope, J.F.(Sheffield, Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, Jno.(Kent, Faversham
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawson, J. Grant (Yorks., N.R.
Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham)
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hon. W. (Bristol, S.)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis(Edinburgh, W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell, W.J.H. (Dumfriessh.)
Milvain, Thomas
Mitchell, Edw. (Fermanagh, N.)
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moore, William
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrison, James Archibald
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute)
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Pease, Herb. Pike (Darlington)
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Plummer, Walter R.
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Randles, John S.
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, Hon. M. W.(Stalybridge
Ridley, S. Forde(Bethnal Green
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J.G.(Oxf'd Univ.
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Webb, Colonel William George
Wharton, Rt. Hon John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-und-Lyne
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W.H. (Yorks.
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E.R.(Bath
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herb. Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Austin, Sir John
Bell, Richard
Boland, John
Brigg, John
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Burns, John
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Cremer, William Randal
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan)
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway)
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobbie, Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Elibank, Master of
Ellice, Capt. E.C(SAndrw'sBghs
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Sir F. H. (Maidstone)
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Fenwick, Charles
Ffrench, Peter
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herb. John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hammond, John
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kilbride, Denis
Kitson, Sir James
Langley, Batty
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Houlton, John Fletcher
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Newnes, Sir George
Nolan, Col. John P.(Galway, N.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid.)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)
O'Malley, William
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)

Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Seely, Maj. J.E.B. (Isle of Wight
Shackleton, David James
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Slack, John Bamford
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C.R. (Northants
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, D. Alfred (Merthyr)
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Jn. Cathcart (Orkney)
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Woodhouse, Sir J.T (Huddersf'd

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Lambert and Mr. Soares.

Resolution to be reported upon Monday next.

LICENSING BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[MR. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 1 :—

*THE CHAIRMAN: The first Amendment on the Paper standing in the name of the hon. Member for Anglesey should come in in line 9. I think it will read better there after the word "shall." The next three Amendments on the Paper have already been disposed of. The next Amendment in the name of the hon. Member for Spalding merely negatives compensation, and the proper place to take that is when the word "compensation" is reached, and he can then move to strike it out. The next four Amendments deal with the time limit and the first three Amendments on the top of the next page also deal with the same subject. The Amendments which come next, standing in the name of the hon. Member for Spen Valley, all refer to the Court before which the question of the renewal of licences is to be considered, and the proper place to raise that is when we reach the words quarter sessions. Then the hon. Member can move to strike out those words and insert such words as he may desire to substitute. I understand that the hon. Member for Huddersfield has taken his Amendment off the Paper. The first Amendment which is in order is the one standing in the name of the hon. Member for Tunbridge.

MR. GRIFFITH BOSCAWEN (Kent, Tunbridge) said the Amendment he had to move raised a question which had excited a great deal of interest, and it was a question whether this clause should be confined to on-licences, or whether it should include off-licences. Two distinct questions were raised by this Amendment. In the first place there was the question of jurisdiction and in the second place the question of compensation. Upon the question of jurisdiction it was, he believed, now the law, and always had been, that the same body which dealt with the renewal or the refusal or the granting of on-licences should deal with off-licences. He thought very considerable inconvenience would arise by drawing a distinction between the two. In the case of the refusal of an on-licence jurisdiction would be transferred to quarter sessions except for the reasons stated in the clause, but in the case of an off-licence the jurisdiction would remain with the petty sessions, and therefore he thought it was a question upon which the Committee was entitled to have some opinion from the Government. As regarded compensation, if an off-licence was taken away for causes other than misconduct he thought a similar rule should apply as in the case of an on-licence. He fully admitted that there were great difficulties in the way, because the case of an off-licence differed very considerably from that of an on-licence. In a public-house the principal business was carried on in connection with the licence, and all that business would cease if the licence was removed. But in the case of an off-licence in connection with a grocery business the amount of business transacted in consequence of the licence would be very much less and therefore the compensation should be smaller.

Although he admitted the difficulty he thought there was certainly a class of off-licences which ought to be dealt with, and which he hoped the Home Secretary would be able to meet—he alluded to off-beerhouses. He did not see why such beerhouses could not be brought under the Bill and treated in the same way as ordinary public-houses. He formally moved his Amendment, and although this might not be the best place to press it, he hoped the Government would state their opinion in reference to this question.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 5, to leave out the words 'an on,' and insert the word 'a.'—(*Mr. Griffith Boscawen.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'an on' stand part of the clause."

Mr. CRIPPS (Lancashire, Stretford) said that in his view it was necessary that both off and on-licences should be dealt with by the same jurisdiction when they were considering the question of whether a licence was necessary or not. He was afraid that on the question of compensation, which he did not think was involved in this Amendment, he should take a different view. He thought there were great differences between off and on-licences for the purpose of compensation, although there was no difference as to jurisdiction. As hon. Members opposite were aware, at the present moment brewster sessions could deal with both and it would be a reactionary method to separate the jurisdiction in regard to two subjects which were so closely connected. Therefore as far as he was concerned he wanted to apply this principle to the jurisdiction but not to compensation.

Sir ROBERT REID (Dumfries Burghs) said he understood this Amendment was in the nature of a preliminary canter for a more serious race. The really important point was whether the class of house indicated by the Amendment was to be brought into the Bill for the purposes of compensation, the question of jurisdiction being in this case one of minor importance. Up to 1880 these licences were, so to speak, freehold licences, but in the years 1880 and 1882 the trade, through the instrumentality of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Croydon, obtained a provision to the effect that these licences should be no longer considered as freehold, but that they should be subject to the absolute discretion of the justices. It was a movement promoted by the trade itself, which thought, apparently, that these off-licences were dangerous competitors. But now, although the competition had been displaced, the brewers wanted to bring in these licences for the purpose of compensation. He sincerely hoped, however, that the Government would not think it necesssary to bestow a perpetual fixity of tenure in the case of these off-licences.

Mr. CORBETT (Glasgow, Tradeston) said the question of these licences had been brought prominently forward in the Report of the Royal Commission, and it had been found that in one town thirty-two out of forty-eight of this class of licences were tied. This Amendment did not deal only with the beerhouses, but also with certain other classes of off-licences. It also dealt with grocers' licences. Attempts had been made to show that some of the provisions of this Bill showed some continuity, but to include grocers' licences was a direct contradiction of that policy. These licences were handed over to the justices as recently as the year 1902, and the Act of Parliament laid down that the licensing justices should have unqualified discretion to refuse a licence upon any grounds which appeared to them sufficient. Another clause in the same Act was still more suggestive as to the reasons which weighed with the House of Commons at the time. That clause provided that the justices might take away a licence on the ground that the licensee had sold surreptitiously or misrepresented the nature of the goods sold under his licence or had in any other way been guilty of misconduct. Special precautions were found to be necessary to prevent abuses by the holders of these licences. For the purpose of checking these abuses, could it be maintained that quarter sessions could protect the public so well as the local justices? This class of licensees had protection for life, and the discretion of the justices would only come into full exercise as new men came upon the scene. The fact that the existing licensees had their life interest fully protected was a reason for not bringing them under the compensation provisions.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.) warned the Government that the acceptance of this Amendment would lead to trouble from Ireland.

THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL (Sir EDWARD CARSON, Dublin University) said it was evident to anyone who understood the law that the Government could not accept the Amendment in this form. It would bring in an immense number of off licences, of which there were some fourteen different kinds. It would be impossible to apply the principles of the Bill to beer off-licences which were used in connection with other businesses. The compensation clause would be inapplicable to a grocer the loss of whose beer licence would not destroy his business. The grocer would in most cases object to coming in under the Bill; for he would have to pay towards the compensation fund on the whole valuation of his premises, and could only receive compensation for the loss of his retail beer business. The scheme of the Bill was not applicable at all to the great majority of the cases in which there were beer off-licences. With regard to the point raised by his hon. and learned friend he was afraid that he was mixing up the beer off-licences which were not merely off-licences where nothing else was sold. He thought the Committee would see that it would be impossible to accept this Amendment which would bring within the principles of this Bill every kind of licence. He did not know that there was any very great demand for dealing with these licences, but at any rate the question must be raised in some particular form limiting it to particular cases he had mentioned. He was not saying that the Government conceded that point, but if it was raised in the way he suggested it would be fully considered. He did not think that the difficulty anticipated by the hon. Member arose. The hon. Member said that the two classes of licences ought to be dealt with by one authority, but in his view of this Bill they would, because both classes of licences would come in the first instance before the brewster sessions, the difference being that if anybody was dissatisfied with the decision of the brewster sessions, they could appeal to the quarter sessions, which would be the final Court of appeal. The other cases suggested in regard to on-licences would necessarily go forward after the brewster sessions had adjudicated, and a report would be sent to the quarter sessions instead of having an appeal. Therefore, in both cases the ultimate tribunal was the quarter sessions, and it certainly was not the intention of the Government to interfere with the existing jurisdiction. Therefore, he did not think there was any real substance in the objection put forward by his hon. and learned friend, and it was impossible for the Government to accept this Amendment.

MR. WHITTAKER (Yorkshire, W.R., Spen Valley) said this discussion was a most interesting one and was throwing some light upon some very interesting points. It was interesting to know from the Solicitor-General that the reason why compensation could not be given to a certain class of licences was based not upon their value or on equity, but upon the fact that another business was carried on upon the premises. Hon. Members from Ireland would be interested in that point, for almost every full public-house licence in that country was for premises on which other businesses were carried on. What about hotels? The main business of hotels was not selling liquor, but providing rooms and food for visitors. Were they going to have an Amendment leaving hotels out from compensation. As to the jurisdicdiction a very interesting point had been raised. The Solicitor-General had told them that both classes of licences would go to the same tribunal. He did not think that would be so; at any rate, not in county boroughs unless he had misunderstood the Bill.

*The CHAIRMAN: All this is rather far away from the question of the off-licences.

Mr. WHITTAKER said he was dealing with the point which the Solicitor-General had raised. The mover of this Amendment raised the question of jurisdiction, and he said that all these licences ought to come under the same jurisdiction. The Amendment applied not only to compensation but to the jurisdiction, and the hon. Member for Tunbridge gave as one of his reasons that they ought to go to the same tribunal. The hon. Member for Stretford dealt only with the point of jurisdiction and the Solicitor-General said that both classes of licences would go to the same tribunal. He wished to point out in the case of county boroughs they would not do so and this only showed the confusion which was likely to result in regard to this jurisdiction. The hon. Member for Tunbridge had referred to the inconvenience of having two jurisdictions dealing with this class of licence, but it seemed to him that they would not get rid of this complication by adopting the Amendment. It appeared to him that they had not yet had the real reason for this Amendment, which was that the discretion of the magistrates with regard to off-licences should be limited and checked. It had been realised that the change proposed with regard to on-licences did hamper and check the power of the justices, and this Amendment was being moved in order that off-licences might be put under a more limited jurisdiction. It was not uniformity that was desired, but the hon. Member opposite desired to bring these licences under the foreign jurisdiction of gentlemen who did not possess local knowledge. According to the speech which had been made by the Solicitor-General, if beer was sold in a jug compensation was to be given, but if it was sold in a bottle compensation was not to be given. He failed to see the distinction of principle.

And, it being Midnight, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon Monday next.

HOME INDUSTRIES BILL.

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged.

Bill withdrawn.

Adjourned at four minutes after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Thursday, 9th June, 1904.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with:—Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 2) [H.L.]; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 4) [H.L.]; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 5) [H.L.]; Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 1) [H.L.]; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 5); Loch Leven Water Power.

Also the Certificates that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with:—Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway (Various Powers); Brymbo Water; Surrey Commercial Dock.

And also the Certificate that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have not been complied with:—Strabane, Raphoe, and Convoy Railway.

The same were ordered to lie on the Table.

Charing Cross, Euston, and Hampstead Railway Bill. A witness ordered to attend the Select Committee.

Tottenham Improvement Bill; Strabane, Raphoe, and Convoy Railway Bill. Examiner's Certificates of non-compliance with the Standing Orders referred to the Standing Orders Committee on Monday next.

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [H.L.]. Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Five Lords appointed a Select Committee on the Manchester Corporation Tramways Bill [H.L.] and other Bills do form the Select Committee for the consideration of the Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [H.L.]. Read, and agreed to: All petitions referred to the Committee, with leave to the petitioners praying to be heard by counsel against the Bill to be heard as desired, as also counsel fo the Bill.

Canal Rates and Charges (Regents Canal) Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]; Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [H.L.]. Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Five Lords appointed a Select Committee on the Oakengates, Dawley, and District Joint Water Board Bill [H.L.] and other Bills do form the Select Committee for the consideration of the Canal Rates and Charges (Regents Canal) Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.] and the Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [H.L.]. Read, and agreed to: All petitions referred to the Committee, with leave to the petitioners praying to be heard by counsel against the Bills to be heard as desired, as also counsel for the Bills.

Great Central and Midland Joint Railways Bill. Read 2ª, and committed.

Scarisbrick Estate (Amendment) Bill [H.L.]; Lord Tredegar's Supplemental Estate Bill [H.L.]; De Trafford Estate Bill [H.L.]. Read 2ª.

Newcastle and Gateshead Water Bill [H.L.]. Read 3ª, and passed, and sent to the Commons.

Liverpool and Wigan Churches Bill [H.L.]. Read 3ª. An Amendment made. Bill passed, and sent to the Commons.

Derwent Valley Water Board Bill [H.L.]; Belfast Corporation (Tramways) Bill [H.L.]. Read 3ª, and passed, and sent to the Commons.

Kirkby-in-Ashfield Urban District Gas Bill. Read 3ª, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [H.L.]; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill [H.L.]; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill [H.L.]; Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [H.L.]. To be read 2ª To-morrow.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill; Local Government Provisional Order (Poor Law) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill. House in Committee (according to order). Bills reported

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

without amendment. Standing Committee negatived; and Bills to be read 3ª To-morrow.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill. House in Committee (according to order). An Amendment made. Standing Committee negatived. The Report of the Amendment to be received To-morrow.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill [H.L.]; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill [H.L.]; Doncaster Corporation Bill; Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway (Steam Vessels) Bill; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [H.L.]; Barnet District Gas and Water Bill. Report from the Committee of Selection, That the following Lords be proposed to the House to form the Select Committee for the consideration of the said Bills; (viz.):—

D. Northumberland (chairman),
D. Wellington,
L. Tenterden,
L. Emly,
L. Cranworth;

agreed to; and the said Lords appointed accordingly. The Committee to meet on Thursday next at Eleven o'clock; and all petitions referred to the Committee, with leave to the petitioners praying to be heard by counsel against the Bills to be heard as desired, as also counsel for the Bills.

PETITION.

SUPPLY OF ELECTRICITY BILL [H.L.].

Petition for amendment of; of Mayor, etc., of St. Pancras; read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND).

Report by George Andrew, Esq., one of His Majesty's Inspectors of Schools in Scotland, on the Gemeindeschulen of Berlin and Charlottenburgh.

AFRICA, No. 7 (1904).

Further correspondence respecting the administration of the Independent State of the Congo (in continuation of "Africa, No. 1 (1904)").

BOARD OF TRADE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD.

Report of the Committee appointed to consider the position and duties of the Board of Trade and of the Local Government Board.

NATIONAL PORTRAIT GALLERY.

Forty-seventh Annual Report of the Trustees of the National Portrait Gallery, 1903–1904.

EASTERN MAIL SERVICE.

Report of the Committee on the Eastern Mail Service.

METEOROLOGICAL GRANT COMMITTEE.

Report of the Committee appointed to inquire into the administration by the Meteorological Council of the existing Parliamentary Grant; together with minutes of evidence and appendices.

NAVIGATION AND SHIPPING.

Annual statement of navigation and shipping of the United Kingdom, for the year 1903.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

SUPERANNUATION.

Treasury Minutes—

Dated 25th May, 1904, declaring that George Hockett, artificer, Royal Small Arms Factory, Enfield, War Office, was appointed without a Civil Service certificate through inadvertence on the part of the head of his department.

Dated 2nd June, 1904, granting a retired allowance to Matthew Farrelly, examining officer, second class, Liverpool Customs, under Section 2 of the Superannuation Act, 1887.

PUBLIC WORKS (IRELAND).

Treasury Minute, dated 3rd June, 1904, authorising the lease of a house and small yard attached at the landward end of the West Pier, Kingstown.

NATIONAL SCHOOL TEACHERS (IRELAND) PENSION FUND.

Account of receipts and payments in respect of the capital and income of the above fund for the period to 31st December, 1903.

HARWICH HARBOUR.

Abstract of the accounts of the receipts and expenditure of the Harwich Harbour Conservancy Board from the time of their incorporation down to and inclusive of the 31st March, 1904.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

UNIVERSITIES OF OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE ACT, 1877.

Statute made by the Governing Body of Trinity College, Oxford, on the 26th February, 1904, amending Statute VI. (Pension Fund) of the Statutes of the College. Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and to be printed. (No. 94.)

SEAMEN'S AND SOLDIER'S FALSE CHARACTERS BILL [H.L.].

House in Committee (according to order); Bill reported without Amendment; and re-committed to the Standing Committee.

AGRICULTURAL PRODUCE AND RAILWAY RATES.

*THE EARL OF LICHFIELD: My Lords, I rise to call attention to correspondence which has recently taken place between the Board of Agriculture and the railway companies; and to ask His Majesty's Government for some further information as to the scope of the reference to the Departmental Committee appointed to inquire as to the existence of preferential railway rates; and to ask what further action the Board have taken to secure freedom of milk from taint of other articles during transit. In February last I drew the attention of the House to the conditions affecting the carriage of milk and other agricultural produce, and in answer to certain Questions I put to him, the noble Earl the President of the Board of Agriculture said he was at that time in correspondence with the railway companies on this subject, and hoped shortly to place that correspondence on the Table of the House together with other information which he was then collecting. The Blue-book I hold in my hand contains the correspondence. It was published before Whitsuntide, and I now desire to draw attention to some of the points contained in it. The correspondence began on 28th September, 1903, with a circular letter from the Board of Agriculture to the railway companies. An answer was received from the railway companies in January, 1904, and a further letter followed from the Board of Agriculture in April last. The first letter written by the Board of Agriculture commenced as follows—

> "I am directed by the President of the Board of Agriculture to inform you that since his appointment to office he has been giving his attention to the general subject of the existing facilities and charges for the conveyance of agricultural requisites and agricultural produce. The necessity of improvement in these respects has been pressed upon Lord Onslow in many directions, and the question is undoubtedly regarded as being one of great importance to the prosperity of the rural districts at the present time."

The letter went on to state that there had been an informal conference of the railway companies, and that—

> "The exchange of views which then took place made it abundantly clear that the companies represented were very ready to consider, in a fair and reasonable spirit, any representations which might be made to them by agriculturists, either directly or through the agency of the Board themselves. At the termination of the conference it was agreed that it would be desirable that the Board should bring under the notice of individual railway companies the various topics which had been discussed in general terms, and in pursuance of this understanding Lord Onslow now desires me to submit the following observations."

The letter contained observations under eight heads. I wish, in the first place, to allude to No. 7, "Foreign and Colonial Produce." Under that head the letter proceeded—

> "An impression undoubtedly exists in agricultural circles that foreign and colonial agricultural produce is conveyed from the ports to the great centres of consumption at rates which compare favourably with those charged for the carriage of British produce from inland stations. The evidence which has from time to time been adduced in support of this belief is not of a satisfactory character, and Lord Onslow is of course well aware that if undue preference could be proved a remedy is provided by Statute."

The communication went on to say—

> "Lord Onslow would therefore be glad to receive information which might be placed before agriculturists as to the rates and conditions specified for the carriage of the principal items of foreign and colonial agricultural produce from the ports of arrival to the great urban centres, with similar information as to sea freights where the companies are also the owners of lines of steamships. Some indication of the principles which guide the companies in the settlement of these rates and conditions might at the same time be given. By this means greater confidence in their propriety would, in Lord Onslow's opinion, be established, and difficulty and friction avoided."

The reply of the railway companies to that portion of the Board of Agriculture's letter was as follows—

> "The railway rates from ports to inland stations are not applicable exclusively to foreign produce, the rates being, on the contrary, applied indiscriminately to home-grown, foreign, or colonial produce so long as the conditions attaching to them are complied with. The request for information as to rates and conditions is of so general a character that it is felt that any information which the companies would be in a position to furnish would not be of any practical value."

In answer to that the Board of Agriculture again wrote, on 16th April—

> "Lord Onslow had hoped that the publication of such information as the companies might have been in a position to supply in response to his inquiries under these heads might have had the effect of removing the existing feeling amongst agriculturists that they are not fairly treated as compared with consignors of agricultural produce from the ports of arrival and the larger urban centres."

And then the Board went on to state that Lord Onslow therefore proposed to appoint a Departmental Committee, the reference to which is set out in the Blue-book as follows—

> "To inquire as to the rates charged by railway companies in Great Britain in respect of the carriage of foreign and colonial farm, dairy, and market-garden produce from the port of shipment or of arrival to the principal urban centres, and to report whether there is any evidence to show that preferential treatment is accorded to such produce as compared with home produce, and, if so, what further steps should be taken, either by legislation or otherwise, to secure the better enforcement of the law in the matter."

I think, my Lords, the Board of Agriculture are fully justified in the appointment of this Committee. This is a very old grievance and one which is always rankling in the minds, not only of the agricultural community, but also of the trading community, and it is a very fitting thing that this Committee should inquire once more whether the charges are really well founded or not. That there is great feeling on the subject is certain, and in evidence of that I should like to call attention to the fact that on a Railway Bill being brought forward in the House of Commons this spring an Instruction to the following effect was moved —

> "That it be an Instruction to the Committee that they insert provisions in the Bill requiring the Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Company, in respect of any through rates for the carriage of merchandise between foreign countries and places in the United Kingdom which the company make or charge, or to which they are party, to set out in their public rate-books at the ports of Goole and Hull, and any ports which may be hereafter established between those places, how much of each such rate is justly and reasonably appropriated by them, or is paid, payable, or agreed to be paid to or by them for (1) land carriage abroad; (2) dock, harbour, and shipping charges abroad; (3) conveyance by sea; (4) dock, harbour, and shipping charges at the British port; (5) and conveyance by railway, either by goods or passenger trains, including any terminal and cartage charges in the United Kingdom."

The object of this Instruction was—

> "To enable traders to ascertain how 'through' railway rates from foreign places are made up. At present these 'through' rates often include in one charge the foreign railway rate, all dock, harbour, and shipping charges, carriage by sea, and the home railway rate; but, if divided under the five heads specified in the Instruction, it will be easier to determine whether any preference is given to foreign as against home produce."

To show the interest that was taken in this proposal I may say that 79 voted for the Instruction and 103 against. The Government took no official part in the division, and those who voted against the Instruction probably thought it unfair to pick out a particular company in a general question of this kind. There is further evidence that this matter requires very careful attention. If we look back to the Report of the Royal Commission on Agricultural Depression published in 1897, and the result of, I think, two years continuous hard work by a very competent body of men, we find the following statement on railway rates, Chapter 8, paragraph 526—

> "It must not, however, be supposed that we view the existing position with satisfaction. We think that it is open to doubt whether legislation has given clear expression and effect to the intentions of Parliament, especially as regards preferential rates on foreign produce and rates which have been increased since 31st

December, 1892, and that the present state of the law is confused, ineffective, and requires amendment."

I contend that on that paragraph alone there is ample justification for the action of the Board of Agriculture in appointing this Committee to inquire into the whole question. I come now to the composition of the Committee. There are upon it my noble friend Lord Jersey, who is Chairman, Sir James Lyle Mackay, and Colonel W. Kenyon-Slaney. These three gentlemen may very well be supposed to represent the public interest in this matter, and they will be well supported by Colonel Sir Herbert Jekyll, an Assistant-Secretary of the Board of Trade, and by Mr. E. Cooper Stoneham, also of the Board of Trade, as secretary. As regards agriculture specially, there are Mr. Ernest G. Haygarth Brown, a superintending inspector of the Board of Agriculture, and Mr. George Lambert, who was on the Royal Commission to inquire into the depression of agriculture, and who is a well known authority on agricultural matters. We then come to the appointment of two gentlemen representing the railway companies—one a railway director, and the other the general manager of one of the great railway companies. I must say it seems to me rather extraordinary to ask these two gentlemen to sit on an inquiry which is going to be held into the conduct of the railway companies, and to consider whether they have infringed the law or not, and, if they have infringed it, what remedies should be provided by legislation. It places them in an invidious position; they cannot be expected to go against their own interests. I quite understand that it was necessary to obtain the co-operation of the railway companies, but I should have thought that could have been managed without actually putting two railway directors on the Committee itself. Perhaps the noble Earl, when he answers my Questions, will give his reasons for having included two railway directors on the Committee. I should next like to refer to the point raised in Lord Onslow's letter with regard to the aggregation of mixed consignments. I am bound to say that the railway companies have, in most cases, come to an agreement on this subject, and are giving considerable help to the agricultural community by their action in this matter. I have before me a leaflet published by the largest of the railway companies, headed "Reduced rates for the Conveyance of Agricultural, Farm, and Dairy Produce, etc." It is stated in the leaflet that—

> "The company are prepared to arrange special rates for regular consignments of agricultural, farm, and dairy produce sent in large quantities by goods or passenger trains."

When we received this leaflet we wrote to ask whether milk would be included under dairy produce. The following was the letter we sent—

> "With reference to the leaflet issued by your company on the subject of reduced rates for farm produce by passenger train, the last paragraph states that special rates are arranged for regular consignments in large quantities. Will you please let me know if this arrangement is applicable to large consignments of milk? For example, from one station there may be fifty churns a day consigned by thirty different senders to thirty different consignees. If from another such station a consignment of fifty churns a day were sent by one consignor to one consignee, would you in the latter case be prepared to quote a specially reduced rate for the carriage of the milk? If so, what special reduction could you allow?"

We have agents now in most of the large towns acting for the farmers; the milk could easily have been consigned to the agents, and thus we could have ensured large and regular consignments. The answer we received from the railway company was as follows—

> "In reply to your favour, I beg to inform you that the rates for the conveyance of milk by passenger train are already on a very low basis, and we cannot see our way to reduce them for such traffic when sent in large quantities."

I do not complain in the least. I know that milk is carried at a low rate. At the same time I call attention to the fact because these leaflets refer to "Dairy Produce," and it would be well in future for the companies to state that milk is excluded.

Then we come to what is, to my mind, the most important part of the Board's observations—namely, the paragraph referring to the loss and damage of produce conveyed at owner's risk, as it more especially affects the milk trade. The Board of Agriculture stated—

> "Representations have from time to time been received by the Board as to the hardship which arises in cases in which consignments of agricultural produce are lost or damaged in consequence of the negligence or misconduct of the

servants of a railway company, but in which no compensation is recoverable by the consignor owing to the fact that the goods were carried at less than the normal rate and at his own risk. It is, of course, to be remembered that the consignor in such a case has contracted himself out of any right to look to the company for redress, but at the same time it is easy to understand that a considerable sense of hardship is excited if this view of the matter is adhered to, whatever may be the fault of the servants of the company. The Board understand that the companies have decided that they will consider claims in respect of total loss in transit, and that they will not refuse to make reasonable compensation in such cases, contributory negligence on the part of the senders or consignees being, of course, taken into consideration. It is also understood that the companies will consider favourably cases where partial loss or damage arises from circumstances which indicate extreme negligence on the part of their servants."

The letter proceeded—

> "There can be no doubt that concessions of this character, administered in a reasonable spirit, would remove a painful cause of controversy and friction."

The noble Earl in this letter expresses the hope that the matter might receive careful consideration. The railway companies, in answer to the Board of Agriculture, stated that—

> "Whilst the railway companies must maintain their legal position in respect to traffic conveyed at the owner's risk, it is their practice, in a friendly way, to consider, on their merits, any cases of total loss, proved pilferage, or misdelivery."

The Board of Agriculture appear to think, from this answer, that the companies are going on a new line altogether and that they will make up in the future for what they have not taken into consideration in the past. The Board in their second letter stated—

> "Lord Onslow believes that the decision of the companies that they will consider on their merits, in a friendly way, any cases of total loss, proved pilferage, or misdelivery, will do much to remove the sense of hardship which from time to time arises under this head, and he desires me to express his appreciation of the policy adopted in the matter."

I would merely point out that, to my certain knowledge, they have adopted this attitude for the past five or six years. We have had repeated occasion to press them for compensation under these particular heads throughout that period. We have had volumes of correspondence, but in most cases there has been very little result and very little compensation.

The Earl of Lichfield.

This is, then, no new departure. It will be noticed that the railway companies only say they will "consider" cases on their merits. Therefore we have not got very far except that they have put this in writing, which no doubt is a distinct advance. We hope later on to induce them to accept in certain cases the whole loss.

I wish to call attention now to the conditions of carriage of milk, which appear on page 88 of this Blue-book. There are eleven conditions, and they are all entirely favourable to the railway companies. Short of inducing the railway companies to accept the whole risk, we must try and get some modification of these very onerous conditions. They are most unsportsmanlike in their one-sidedness. Everything is in favour of the railway companies, and there is not one single point in favour of the poor farmer. He has to prepay his milk, and it will be remembered that on a former occasion I called attention to one case where the milk had been eleven days on the road, and where the railway company refused to pay any compensation. I also quoted another case where the milk was lost altogether, the railway company again refusing any compensation. I would ask the Board of Agriculture to consider whether they cannot help the farmer by inducing the railway companies to make some modification in these onerous conditions of carriage, so that the risk note may not put on the farmer such a heavy responsibility. No. 6 of the conditions of carriage states that—

> "The senders and consignees must assist in the loading and unloading of the cans when the milk is carried at the reduced rate."

Of course, a great deal of the milk comes to London and other places in the middle of the night, and the railway companies in those cases take the milk out of the vans and put it on the platforms themselves. In all cases the railway companies, for their own purposes, check the milk on its arrival, but several of the large railway companies do not make the consignees sign for the milk before they take it away. That is a great hardship on the farmer. Signatures are obtained by a good many of the large companies, but not by all. We want to induce all railway companies to obtain signatures from the consignees before allowing the milk to be removed from the platform. As things are at present, if a dishonest consignee chooses to say that he did not receive the milk, there is nothing to prove that he did. I very much hope that in this particular case the Board of Agriculture will do all they possibly can to induce those railway companies which do not now adopt the practice to obtain signatures from the consignees before allowing them to remove the milk. Condition No. 10 is really the risk note which the farmer has to sign. It states that—

> "Two rates are in operation for the carriage of milk—one the ordinary rate, when the company accept the ordinary liability of a railway company with respect to the carriage of perishable merchandise by passenger train."

Except for very short distances that rate is, of course, prohibitive and is hardly ever employed. The paragraph proceeds—

> "The other, a reduced rate adopted when the sender agrees to relieve the company and all other companies or persons over whose line the traffic may pass, or in whose possession the same may be during any portion of the transit, from all liability for loss, damage, misdelivery, delay, or detention, either with respect to the milk or the milk-cans when full or empty, except upon proof that such loss, damage, misdelivery, delay, or detention arose from wilful misconduct on the part of the company's servants."

Again I ask the Board of Agriculture if they cannot assist us in obtaining some modification of these very onerous conditions. I maintain that when there is total loss the company should pay that loss, and when they misdeliver the milk, or it has been many days on the journey, the least they can do is to pay compensation for its loss. If modifications in this clause could be agreed to by the railway companies, it would do a great deal to remove the undoubted friction which now exists. I hope the Board will consider whether they cannot help us in this respect. I would suggest that the modification should be such as to let the farmer take responsibility for what may be reasonably assumed to be accidental, and make the company responsible for what is due to carelessness.

There is one more point I wish to bring to the notice of your Lordships, namely, the insanitary state of many of the milk vans. The noble Earl the President of the Board of Agriculture called attention to this question in his letter to the railway companies in April last, in which he said—

> "Lord Onslow desires me to take the opportunity of saying that he has recently received very numerous complaints as to the unsuitable and even insanitary conditions under which milk is from time to time conveyed."

This Blue-book was published before any answer was received from the railway companies, and I hope that when my noble friend replies to me he will be able to tell the House that the railway companies have accepted this proposal in a reasonable spirit. I called attention in February last to the fact that fish, offal, and live boars were very often sent in milk vans. The noble Earl said live bores pervaded all classes of society, and that it was difficult to get rid of them; but I hope that at any rate they will be excluded in future from milk vans. I do not know what the answer of the railway companies was, but I would point out that this grievance is still going on. I have in my hand two letters from farmers, one written on the 31st of May, and the other on the 1st of this month. In the first letter the writer states that almost every morning there is fish in the milk van, and that the water from them runs out in the van. He adds that the stench is sometimes very bad indeed, and that with the warm weather coming he is afraid there will be complaints about the milk not keeping. The other farmer writes—

> "I understand you have had, or are having, a complaint from Mr. —— about fish being in the same van as milk. I can endorse this. The stench is something awful. The liquid runs out of the van on to the footboard many a time, and when you open the door it makes you stand back."

It will be seen from the date of these letters that the grievance is still going on. I hope the President of the Board of Agriculture will be able to tell us that the railway companies are taking this matter seriously in hand, and will introduce remedies. It is not a matter that affects agriculturists alone; it affects the public very largely, because, if the milk arrives at the big centres contaminated or tainted, there is risk of injury to the health of the general population. I hope that if the Board of Agriculture are not able to deal with this alone, they will induce the Local Government Board to assist them in getting the railway companies to convey milk in suitable vans. In conclusion, I desire to congratulate the noble Earl the President of the Board of Agriculture on having initiated this friendly correspondence with the railway companies, for I am sure that in the end the result will be of benefit to the agricultural community.

Lord BURGHCLERE: My Lords, before the noble Earl the President of the Board of Agriculture answers the Questions of my noble friend, perhaps I may be permitted to make a very few remarks on this subject. Whilst I agree with many of the observations of the noble Earl who raised this question there was, however, one remark with regard to the composition of the Committee with which I am not so thoroughly in accord. I refer to the introduction of railway directors. For my own part, I think that if, in the words of the noble Lord, we are to obtain the cooperation of the railway companies in this matter, which it is highly desirable we should do, it is only fair that the companies should have some representative on the Committee. You might just as well appoint a Committee to consider the question of temperance and not put any brewers on it as appoint this Committee without including representatives of the railway companies. I should like to be allowed to join with the noble Earl in congratulating the President of the Board of Agriculture on the course which he has pursued. I think, if he will permit me to say so, he has taken a highly judicious course in writing in a friendly spirit to the railway companies on this matter. He has raised a subject of considerable importance to agriculturists at large, and I have great hopes that the outcome of his efforts may be of benefit both to agriculture and to the public generally.

The noble Earl behind me has fully pointed out to your Lordships the course which the President of the Board of Agriculture has adopted. He wrote a general letter to the railway companies, and received a reply which I consider to be of special value. I think it is the first time we have had an authoritative answer from the railway companies with regard to the interesting points which the noble Earl opposite raised in his circular letter. We then have the second letter of my noble friend somewhat criticising the reply of the railway companies, and the whole finally culminates in the appointment of a Committee with regard to one particular subject, and it is rather in that direction that I would venture to make one or two observations. I do not think it would have been right for the noble Earl to have acted otherwise than he has done in limiting the Committee to the specific object he had in view. The question of preferential railway rates is of a highly complex and difficult nature, and it would have been unwise on the part of my noble friend to have overburdened the Committee by adding other subjects.

I fully concur in what the noble Earl behind me said with regard to the conveyance of milk. The noble Earl the President of the Board of Agriculture has himself very strongly drawn the attention of the railway companies to the evils that might result from the contact of milk with insanitary matter during transit. That is a question of the highest importance to farmers, because dairy farming is, as we all know, an increasing industry in this country, and therefore it is desirable that the trade should not be injured by conditions over which the farmers have no control. This question of the proper transit of milk has a far wider bearing. It has an effect on the public health generally. I think my noble friend might be able to do something with the help of his own inspectors, who might press upon the railway companies the desirability of observing sanitary conditions in the conveyance of milk. If that particular subject does not come quite within the purview of my noble friend's Department, he, as a member of His Majesty's Government, can press it on the attention of the Local Government Board. Before I leave the question of the milk supply, I would ask my noble friend whether he is satisfied with the replies of the railway companies, and, if not, what course he proposes to pursue with a view of securing that the measures he himself has so strongly pressed upon the railway companies shall be carried out.

On the subject of the conveyance of small parcels of farm and dairy produce, the reply of the railway companies was to this effect—

> "There are already specially low rates in operation on all railways for farm and dairy produce in small quantities, as well as still lower exceptional rates for larger quantities, and the companies are of opinion that these rates, generally speaking, sufficiently meet the case."

I do not like the words "generally speaking," and I should like to ask the noble Earl whether he is quite satisfied with that reply. I notice that he himself, in a further letter, states that the practice of the various lines is by no means uniform, and I think it would be desirable if he could obtain from the railway companies a guarantee that as far as possible the practice should be uniform. On the subject of rates and charges from rural stations, the Board of Agriculture, in their letter to the railway companies, stated—

> "Lord Onslow is aware that such anomalies cannot be altogether avoided, especially in the face of competition with carriage by water, but he is of opinion that something might be done in the direction of the equalisation of the rates for the carriage of goods from the rural districts with those enjoyed by traders in urban districts."

I consider that to be a very important question. What is the reply of the railmay companies? It is brief, but I do not think it is entirely satisfactory. They say—

> "The companies are unable to admit that this complaint has any general application."

I would not go so far as to say that the railway companies had ventured to snub so important a person as my noble friend, but I do think the answer is of a somewhat terse and perfunctory character. I again ask whether my noble friend is satisfied with that reply, and, if he is not satisfied, what action he has taken or intends to take to get his wishes carried out. I hope the noble Earl will be able to state that, if necessary, he will use all his powers, not only the powers of his own Department but his powers as a member of His Majesty's Government, to secure the carrying out of the reforms he has set forth; and, if he is successful, he will have conferred a great benefit on agriculturists and the public at large.

*THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES (The Earl of ONSLOW): My Lords, I have no complaint to make of the tone of the remarks either of the noble Earl who introduced the subject or of the noble Lord opposite who at one time occupied the office I now have the honour to hold. I am glad to find that there is a general opinion in your Lordships' House that the question of railway rates, and especially as to whether a preference is or is not given by the railway companies to goods of foreign origin, is of great importance to the community and ought to be determined without delay. As your Lordships will have gathered from the remarks of the two noble Lords who have spoken, a Committee has been appointed to consider the subject. I am extremely glad that the noble Earl on the back benches, Lord Jersey, whose acquaintance with these subjects is well known, and who is a prominent agriculturist, has consented to be the Chairman, and I have also secured as members of the Committee several gentlemen who are deeply interested in agricultural subjects. I am told that the blot on the Committee is that there is upon it a railway director and a general manager of a railway. I would say, in passing, that Mr. Baldwin, besides being a director of the Great Western Railway Company, is largely interested in agricultural matters—he is a member of the Central Chamber of Agriculture in London —and Sir Charles Owens, the general manager of the London and South Western Railway, is perhaps better acquainted with this intricate and difficult subject than any other man connected with the railway interest.

I am asked why I placed railway men on the Committee at all. Unless a Royal Commission had been appointed, with powers to send for persons and papers and to examine witnesses on oath, it would be almost impossible to get from the railway companies the necessary information about rates unless they were willing to give it. There is one stage in these proceedings which is not contained in the Blue-book. I had an interview with the chairmen of all the railway companies who carry produce from the Continent to England and the Channel Islands, and I obtained from them a most unqualified assurance that every possible assistance in finding out what the rates are should be given to the Committee. Under those circumstances I think it would not only have been unwise, but most unfair to the railway companies, if they had not been represented on the Committee. As to legislation the reference to the Committee speaks of "legislation or otherwise," and what I had in my mind was not so much whether it would be desirable for Parliament to carry out the views of the Committee by legisation as whether it might not be possible to bring the questions at issue between agriculturists, traders, and railway companies before some tribunal at much less expense and with less paraphernalia than are involved in taking a case going before the Railway Commissioners. With regard to the milk traffic, to which both noble Lords attached considerable importance, I think it is very desirable that cases of compensation for total loss, for pilfering, and for misdelivery should be considered, and for the first time, I think, the railway companies have agreed to consider these questions.

An important point which has not been touched on is the holding of local conferences where there are disputes between the agriculturist and the railway companies. The first of such conferences took place at Northallerton yesterday, and I am informed that, broadly, the result has been that both parties will in future meet each other half-way. I may say that I am not satisfied with the reply which I received from the railway companies on the question of uniformity of charges for small parcels, and I am pursuing the subject further. There is a great deal of difference between the companies measured by the extent to which they are interested in this question. There are some which depend almost entirely on agricultural produce and others to whom the agricultural traffic is a mere bagatelle, and it is difficult to get the latter companies to adopt a basis of charge as low as that which obtains on the lines which depend more largely on this traffic. But my efforts are directed, if I may use the phrase, to getting the companies to work on a most-favoured-company basis, so that we may get as low charges on all the lines as are now made by the companies which treat the agricultural interest most kindly.

I believe the railway companies are anxious that milk shall in very case be carried without contamination. The companies give general orders to their servants, but we know only too well in the case of our own establishments that general orders are not always carried out. The companies have begged me, whenever a case of milk being carried under insanitary conditions is brought to the notice of the Board of Agriculture, to acquaint the general manager of the company concerned, who will at once take steps to have the matter inquired into. There are three kinds of vans, and the only case in which contamination can occur is when the milk is carried in the guard's van, where pigs or dogs may also be carried. I think that care should be taken to avoid this. It would be desirable if milk were sent in more convenient churns that could be locked, so as to prevent pilfering. Farmers are occasionally prosecuted for mixing water with their milk and fined, and it has been afterwards found that the adulteration has been practised by the porters of the railway company. It would be better, too, if the tops of the milk churns were convex instead of concave, so that articles could not be put on them. I heard of a case the other day where a porter placed a bag of periwinkles on the top of a milk churn, and the salt drippings from the bag presumably trickled into the milk. I am glad to think that both the noble Earl and my noble friend, who was formerly President of the Board of Agriculture, welcome the appointment of a Committee of Inquiry into this matter. I know it has exercised for some time past the minds of the agricultural community, who believe they have been unfairly treated by the railway companies. I am perfectly satisfied from the composition of the Committee and the friendly spirit which the railway companies have shown towards the inquiry, that the Committee will be able to arrive at the truth, and that if there are grievances it will not be beyond the powers of the Committee to suggest what steps should be taken to remedy them.

MILITARY MANŒUVRES ACT, 1897.

Moved, That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty, praying His Majesty to make the Order in Council under the Military Manœuvres Act, 1897.

a draft of which was presented to this House on the 8th March last.—(*The Viscount Hutchinson* (*E. Donoughmore*)).

Agreed to.

Ordered, That the said Address be presented to His Majesty by the Lords with White Staves.

House adjourned at half-past Five o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 9th June, 1904.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS.

The Clerk at the Table informed the House of the unavoidable absence of the Chairman of Ways and Means.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH.)

MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz.: —Newcastle-upon-Tyne Corporation Bill [Lords]. Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time.

North-Western Electricity and Power Gas Bill. Read the third time, and passed.

Skipton Water and Improvement Bill. Read the third time, and passed. [New Title.]

Dundee, Broughty Ferry, and District Tramways Order Confirmation Bill; Leith Burgh Order Confirmation Bill. Read a second time; to be considered upon Monday next.

Leith Corporation Tramways Order Confirmation Bill. Read a second time.

Motherwell and Bellshill Railway (Abandonment) Order Confirmation Bill. Read a second time; to be considered upon Monday next.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to—Sheppy Gas Bill, without Amendment.

Colney Hatch Gas Bill; North Staffordshire Railway Bill; Gomersal Gas Bill, with Amendments.

Amendments to—Gosport Water Bill [Lords]; Metropolitan Railway Bill [Lords]; West Metropolitan Railway (Abandonment) Bill [Lords]; Harlow and Sawbridgeworth Gas Bill [Lords]; Liverpool and London and Globe Insurance Company Bill [Lords]; University of Leeds Bill [Lords]; Yorktown and Blackwater Gas Bill [Lords]; Chesterfield Corporation (Tramways and Improvements) Bill [Lords]; without Amendment.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act for the suppression of Betting in Streets and other public places." [Street Betting Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confirm a Provisional Order made by the Board of Education, under the Education Acts, 1870 to 1903, to enable the council of the city and county borough of Birmingham to put in force the Lands Clauses Acts." [Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (Birmingham) Bill [Lords.]

And, also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act for rendering valid certain Letters Patent granted to Richard Jaeger in respect of an invention for an improved process for the dry slaking of lime and apparatus therefor. [Richard Jaeger's Patent Bill [Lords.]

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (Birmingham) Bill [Lords]. Read the first time; Referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 224.]

Richard Jaeger's Patent Bill [Lords]. Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Inverness, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions against; from Glossop; Middleton-in-Teesdale; Love's Beechburn; Stanley Colliery; Callington; Blunts; Witton Junction; Broughton Park; Machen; Tideford; Kidwelly; Whitland; Stroud; Chalford; Fir Tree; St. George's-in-the-East; Glasgow (five); Trawdon; Loughborough; Northampton (two); Harwood-in-Teesdale; Sevenoaks (two); Nuneaton; Derby; Newquay (two); Rochester; Western Favell; Little Houghton; Great Billing; Ecton; Hertford; North Kensington; Carhampton; Acocks Green; Oldham; Bridlington; Enfield; Plymouth; Hadfield; Hylton Colliery; North Shields (four); Ecclesall (two); Middle Marsh; Radcliffe: Burnham; Garton; Silloth; Bridport; Botton; Bolton (two); Dunster; Ayr; Oban; South Ayr; Lintz Colliery; Burnopfield; Winlaton; Fellside; Bridlington Quay; Brindley Ford; Wheddon Cross; Greenock; West Dorset; Paisley; Putney; Winsford; Mytholmroyd; Methley; Liverpool; Charlesworth; Wimblington; Fairburn; Hightown; Kidderminster; Haughton Green; Shetland; Newton Toney; Whiteparish; West Grimstead; Blaydon-on-Tyne; Eccles; Allonby; Warwick Bridge; Clayton; Stocksbridge; Minehead; Luton (two); Harpenden; Abergele; Colwyn Bay (two); Llandyrnog; Macclesfield (two); Great Yarmouth; Bardwell; Ardwick; Ford; Goldenhill; Congleton; Henshaw; Prudhoe Station; Nether Hallam; Chatteris; Bilston; Daw Bank; Maidstone (two); Pilling; Birmingham (three); Brightside; Hebden Bridge (three); Wrexham (two); Flamstead; Kinsbourne Green; Markyate; Hatfield; Chaul End; Huddersfield; Dulwich; Weaste; Saint Pancras; Barnard Castle; Pontypridd; Crigglestone; Coundon Grange; Quernmore; Westhoughton; Oxford Place; Watton Little Cressingham; Saham Toney; Stirlingshire; Bideford (two); Carmarthen; Borough; Walker; Brandon; Chertsey; Greenwich; Ludlow; Barningham; Stanford; Fenton; Brentwood; Woodland; Chorley; Dalton; Moor; Stainton; Bowes; Brailsford; Ashbourne; Kirkcaldy; Longsight; Burntisland; Cromer; Pegswood; Tarbert; Maindee; Ilford; Rothwell; Leeds; Horsforth (two); Outwood; Lower Altofts; Loscoe; Blaenplwyf; Ystumtuen; North Seaton; Watford; Garforth; Skelmanthorpe; Cwmbrwyne; Bridge of Earn; Sunderland; Kinghorn; Manchester; Mingoose St. Agnes; Gwennap; Whitwood; North Bitchburn; Crosby Garrett; Gaisgill; Kirkby Stephen; Stokesley; Rodley; Parwich; Loddon; Gildersome; Farsley; St. Helens (two); Prudhoe; Barnsley (two); Pallion; and Halton and Crossgates; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Petition from Canterbury, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

TRAWLERS' CERTIFICATES SUSPENSION BILL.

Petition from Inverness, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

VALUATION BILL.

Petitions for alteration; from Haltwhistle; Bromsgrove; Turton; and Westminster; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

EAST INDIA (NATURAL FERTILISERS).

Return presented, relative thereto [Address 7th June; *Mr. Emmott*]; to lie upon the Table.

METEOROLOGICAL GRANT (COMMITTEE).

Copy presented, of Report of the Committee appointed to inquire into the administration by the Meteorological Council of the existing Parliamentary Grant, together with Minutes of Evidence and Appendices [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

ELECTRIC LIGHTING ACTS, 1882 AND 1888.

Copy presented, of Special Reports by the Board of Trade under Section (1) of The Electric Lighting Act, 1888, respecting—(1) Bothwell Electric Lighting Order, 1904; (2) Houghton-le-Spring and District Electric Lighting Order, 1904;

(3) Kilpatrick Electric Lighting Order, 1904; (4) Kingswood Electric Lighting Order, 1904; (5) Northampton and District Electric Lighting Order, 1904; (6) Shettleston Electric Lighting Order, 1904 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

IRISH LAND ACT, 1903.

Return ordered, "of Estates purchased by the Congested Districts Board for Ireland in respect of the period of six months ended the 30th day of April, 1904, for the purposes of resale to tenants and the enlargement of holdings, in the following form:—(1) County; (2) Number of estates; (3) Number of holdings under permanent tenancies; (4) Acreage of lands under permanent tenancies and temporary lettings (*a*) tenanted, (*b*) untenanted, (*c*) total; (5) Purchase money; (6) Gross rental."—(*Mr. Wyndham.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

The Number of Men Employed in Building the Victoria and Albert Museum.

SIR HENRY FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.): To ask the hon. Member for Chorley, as representing the First Commissioner of Works, how many men are now regularly employed in the building of the Victoria and Albert Museum.

(*Answered by Lord Balcarres.*) The number of men now regularly employed on the work is 550, of whom 320 are on the building and 230 are preparing the stonework at the masons' yard.

The New Silver Coinage.

MR. BAYLEY (Derbyshire, Chesterfield): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether all the new silver coinage is being struck at His Majesty's Mint; and, if not, will he state the names of any firms that are minting on behalf of the Government, and the terms of any contracts made with those firms.

(*Answered by Mr. Victor Cavendish.*) Yes, Sir. All the new silver coinage is being struck at the Royal Mint.

Religious Observance in Voluntary Schools.

MR. HALSEY (Hertfordshire, Watford): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether His Majesty's Inspectors have, or have not, acted in accordance with instructions received from the Board of Education in approving a time table for a voluntary school which provides for the attendance at church of those children whose parents do not object, on certain specified days, during the time set apart for any religious observance or instruction in religious subjects.

(*Answered by Sir William Anson.*) The Education Department held in 1871, that attendance at church, as described in the Question, was not attendance at school; but that where children, with the consent of their parents, attended church in place of receiving religious instruction in the school premises, they should not be marked on the register while so absent, and that the occasions on which they were to be absent for this purpose should appear on the time table, in order to show that they were not in attendance at school. As attendance at church has never been regarded as attendance at school, and as by-laws now usually require that attendance at school should be for the whole time during which the school is open, it seems to the Board that the time table should not contain any reference to arrangements which have nothing to do with school hours or school attendance, and instructions to this effect are being given to His Majesty's Inspectors.

Sanitary Condition of Post Office at 10, Oxford Street.

MR. BAYLEY: To ask the Postmaster-General whether he will give directions that inquiry should be made into the sanitary condition of the telegraph office at 10, Oxford Street; and whether, in view of the admitted unsuitability of this office for the purposes for which it is used, steps will be taken immediately to acquire new premises.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) I am not aware that the branch post office at No. 10, Oxford Street, is insanitary, but it is certainly too small. I have been for some time in treaty for more suitable premises in the locality, and I hope to be in a position to carry out the transfer before very long. Meanwhile I am taking steps which will improve to some extent the conditions in the instrument room and in the office generally.

Clones Post Office.

Mr. M'KEAN (Monaghan, S.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that the telegraph room in the new post office at Clones is very small and lighted from an overhead passage, and that the women's lavatory is adjoining this room; and, if so, will he say whether this room was inspected by the Post Office officials having charge of the proper conditions of buildings; and whether he will investigate the matter with a view to improvement.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) The new post office at Clones was opened on the 13th ultimo. I am assured that an excellent office has been provided. In an office of this class a large instrument room is not required and the space now available is sufficient. The women's retiring room opens off the instrument room, but it has separate light and ventilation, and the arrangement is not open to any objection in the case of such a small office. The instrument room is lighted from the roof.

Post Office Guide—List of Offices with Sunday Despatch and Delivery.

Mr. NUSSEY (Pontefract): To ask the Postmaster-General whether, for the public convenience, he can give directions in the next and subsequent issues of the Postal Guide to make a distinction between those offices which have a Sunday despatch and delivery, and those which have no such service.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) Some information as regards Sunday deliveries is already given in the table of mails from London to provincial offices. To give any further information of this sort would necessarily make the Guide more complicated than it is at present; and, as I am not sure that any commensurate advantage would ensue, I should like to have some time to consider the question.

Chinese Seamen on the British Steamship "Turbo."

Mr. JOYCE (Limerick): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been directed to the trial and conviction of fourteen Chinese seamen at the North Shields Police Court on 31st May last, on the alleged ground of disobeying the commands of the master of the British steamship "Turbo," owned by the Shell Transport and Trading Company, Limited; whether he is aware that the magistrate suggested that an interpreter should be provided for these men, and that the master of the "Turbo" declared this to be unnecessary; and, if so, can he state if these fourteen Chinamen were engaged and signed on at Singapore, as stated in evidence by the master of the "Turbo"; and whether he is aware that on 1st April last, the same master of the British steamship "Turbo" had trouble with fourteen Chinese seamen who were discharged from that vessel at Gravesend, the Chinamen alleging that the master had not complied with the terms of the agreement which he made with them, and that these Chinese seamen were charged £1 each as deduction for police expenses, without the matter being decided before a magistrate.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) I have received reports on the subject to which the hon. Member refers from the superintendents of the Mercantile Marine Offices at Gravesend and North Shields, and the owners of the steamship "Turbo" have also furnished me with information. As regards the trial of the Chinamen at North Shields, the facts as stated are in the main correct, but it appears that, although an interpreter was not present when the men were first brought before the Court, the magistrate remanded them until an interpreter could be obtained, and the seamen were thus enabled to acquaint the Bench with their position before sentence was passed. According to the agreement of the vessel, all these Chinamen, with one exception, had been engaged at Singapore as stated by the master. From the report furnished by the superintendent at Gravesend, it appears that on 1st April the Chinese firemen on board the "Turbo" refused duty, and eventually fifteen of them were discharged by mutual consent. No complaint was made by the men as to the sums paid to them in respect of wages, which they stated to be correct. I am further informed by the owners that a deduction of £1 a head for police expenses was not made.

Refused Licences.

MR. ALFRED DAVIES (Carmarthen Boroughs): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he will inform the House of the number of refused victuallers' beerhouse, and other licences, with the ground of refusal, respectively for 1901 and 1902.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) The only information in my possession in regard to refusals to renew licences in past years is contained in Returns which have from time to time been laid before Parliament. No such Return was made for the year 1901, and in 1902 there was no general annual licensing meeting outside London.

Perth Quarter Sessions—Summoning of Justices.

MR. BUCHANAN (Perthshire, E.): To ask the Secretary for Scotland whether in calling the statutory meeting of quarter sessions for the election of justices to serve on the county district Licensing Courts as well as on the Appeal and Confirmation Courts, the clerk is bound to summon all the justices and not a section only; whether his attention has been called to the fact that this was omitted to be done in the county of Perth at the quarter sessions meeting in March last, and at the Appeal and Confirmation Court in May; and whether he will give instructions that in future the clerk shall cite all justices to quarter sessions, and all members of the various Licensing Courts to the meetings of such Courts.

(*Answered by Mr. A. Graham Murray.*) My attention has been called to the incident referred to in the second paragraph of the hon. Member's Question. The conduct of the justice of peace clerk is not a matter as to which I have any jurisdiction, and must be regulated by the justices themselves.

Admiralty Yatch "Enchantress."

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if the yacht "Enchantress" is now in commission; what is the difference between her cost as finished and the estimate on which the order was given; where did the speed trials take place, and what was the realised speed as compared with the speed contracted for; did coal consumption trials take place, and, if so, what were the results; and what was the duration of the speed and coal consumption trials respectively.

(*Answered by Mr. Pretyman.*) The "Enchantress" is now in commission. The difference between her cost as finished and the estimate on which the order was given is about £1,200. The speed trials took place in the Irish Channel and Skelmorlie measured mile. Only the trial at fifteen knots was carried out, as it was considered that the pitch of propellers was not suitable for the higher speed of eighteen knots. The eighteen-knot trial will be deferred until new propellers are ready. The coal consumption at fifteen knots was 1.94 lbs. per i.h.p. per hour for twenty-four hours.

Employment of Solicitors for Vaccination Prosecutions in Lambeth.

MR. CORRIE GRANT (Warwickshire, Rugby): To ask the President of the Local Government Board if he is aware that at Lambeth Police Court on 31st May three persons were summoned by the Lambeth vaccination officer before Mr. Hopkins for neglecting to have their children vaccinated; that in each case a solicitor appeared in support of the summons, and each person was ordered to pay 25s. costs; and whether he will instruct the vaccination officer not to employ a solicitor except in cases of special difficulty.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) I have no information as to the cases referred to, but I am making inquiry on the subject.

Additional Expenditure under the Indian Councils Bill.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask the Secretary of State for India if he will state what additional expenditure will be incurred in salaries or otherwise under the Indian Councils Bill.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) The Indian Councils Bill does not increase the number of memberships of Council; it merely removes the special qualifications and conditions now connected with one of them. It is, however, intended, if this Bill is passed, to appoint the full authorised number of Members of Council, instead of leaving one post unfilled, as at present; and it is possible that some increase of the secretariat may in consequence be required; but as to this no details have yet been settled. The pay of a Member of Council is £5,333 a year.

Political Effects of English Education in India.

MR. HUMPHREYS-OWEN (Montgomeryshire): To ask the Secretary of State for India whether before legislating on higher education the Government of India instituted an inquiry into the political effect of English education in India; and, if so, whether he will state the substance of the views expressed by the various local governments on this subject.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) I am not aware of any inquiry directed specially to the subject stated in the hon. Member's Question. The recent legislation of the Government of India in regard to the Indian Universities was, however, preceded by an inquiry into University education in that country by a Commission, whose Report was published in 1902; and in the debates on the Universities Bill, which will be found in the Gazette of India for April last, the various aspects of higher education in India were discussed very fully.

Estate of the Dewan of Dhar.

MR. WEIR: To ask the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that on the death of Bapu Raghunath, Dewan of Dhar, his property was divided amongst his sons, and that because the portion belonging to one of the sons, viz., Ramchandra Rao, was confiscated in November, 1857, on account of his alleged complicity in the Mutiny, Krishna Rao Raghunath and Shanka Rao Bhagwant, who are the descendants of Ramchandra Rao's brothers, have been denied access to the property belonging to their forefathers; and will he consider the expediency of ordering some inquiry with a view to the restoration of this property to these claimants.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) The facts of the case were stated in a reply to a Question of the hon. Member on the 12th May, 1902,† by the late Secretary of State. I agree with him in declining to interfere further with the discretion of the Native State in the matter.

Terms of Loans for Irish Labourers' Cottages.

MR. CLANCY (Dublin County, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been directed to the statement of the chairman of the North Dublin Rural District Council, in reference to the terms on which the latest loan for the building of labourers' cottages in that district has been sanctioned, that the terms referred to were so onerous that they would largely tend to prevent the working of the Labourers Acts in the future; and whether he will take such declarations into consideration with a view, by means of an Amendment of the Labourers Bill now before the House, to render those terms less burdensome to the ratepayers of Ireland.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The terms upon which such loans are sanctioned are fixed by the Treasury and apply to all loans advanced out of the Local Loans Fund on the security of local rates.

Wages of Central African Natives in Transvaal Mines.

SIR JOHN GORST (Cambridge University): To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the minimum wage offered to natives recruited in Central Africa for the Transvaal mines will now be reduced from 1s. 6d. to 1s. per diem for the first six months after their arrival at the mines, so as to correspond with the minimum wage offered to Chinese coolies.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Lyttelton.*) The British Central African natives now being recruited are, I understand, to be engaged under the same conditions as those recruited last year, as stated at page 14 of Cd. 1950.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cvii., 1343.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

The Sinking of the "Thistle."

SIR JOHN LENG (Dundee): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the steamer "Thistle," which sunk at Haulbowline Island on Monday morning, has been raised, and, if not, by whom the salvage operations are being conducted; and whether Admiralty plant is being employed.

*THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. PRETYMAN, Suffolk, Woodbridge): She has not yet been raised. The salvage operations are being conducted by the Admiralty.

CAPTAIN DONELAN (Cork County, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the cause which led to the sudden sinking of the Admiralty steam launch "Thistle" in Queenstown Harbour on Monday last has been ascertained; and whether periodical examinations are made of this class of vessel, and reports furnished as to their condition.

*MR. PRETYMAN: The sinking of the Admiralty launch "Thistle" in Queenstown Harbour on Monday was not due to any defect, but to the fact that two scuppers were left open, and when the men left the vessel she heeled over and brought the open scupper below the water line.

CAPTAIN DONELAN: Did the vessel carry an unusual number of passengers across?

*MR. PRETYMAN: It has nothing to do with the overloading of the vessel. The scuppers, being close to the water line, ought not to have been left open. The men all left her on the starboard side and thus caused her to heel over and the water poured in.

SIR JOHN LENG: If outside assistance is required will British Salvage Companies have an opportunity of undertaking the work?

*MR. PRETYMAN: Yes, Sir; communications have already been sent inquiring if outside assistance is necessary.

Lord Roberts' Salary.

MR. MARKHAM (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if Field-Marshal Earl Roberts' full pay is continued up to January, 1906, while the pay of the other officers in high command, who were similarly and simultaneously relieved of their positions on 9th February last, ceased sixty days after their retirement; and, if so, can he explain the ground for the difference in the treatment of these officers from that enjoyed by the late Commander-in-Chief, seeing this officer received a gratuity of £100,000 during the Boer War.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): The facts are as stated in the Question. Field-Marshal Lord Roberts, at the special request of the Prime Minister, consented to place his services at the disposal of the Committee of Imperial Defence and it was accordingly decided that he should be retained on full pay until the period of his employment as Commander-in-Chief would normally have expired.

MR. SEYMOUR ORMSBY-GORE (Lincolnshire, Gainsborough): May I ask whether Lord Roberts will not be employed on this Committee subsequently to January, 1906? In that case will his pay be continued?

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: If that contingency arises it will have to be considered.

3rd North Staffordshire Regiment—Case of William Vernon.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is now in a position to state under what circumstances Captain Crosthwaite, of the 3rd North Staffordshire Regiment, signed a certificate for the arrest of William Vernon of that regiment as an absentee, seeing that Vernon was at the time absent from duty on leave under a certificate signed by the same officer; and will he explain why the military authorities were not represented when the stipendiary magistrate at Hanley, Staffordshire, before whom Vernon was brought on the 30th May, ordered his release.

Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER: Private Vernon, 3rd Battalion North Staffordshire Regiment, was granted leave from the annual training by the adjutant, Captain Crosthwaite, on the 26th April. Through inadvertence the adjutant reported this militiaman to the police authorities as an absentee; consequently, he was arrested at Tunstall and a report was made by the police to the officer commanding the 3rd Battalion North Staffordshire Regiment on Sunday, the 29th May. The same day the regimental authorities telephoned to Police Inspector Dodd of Tunstall that Vernon had been arrested in error, and the inspector replied that he would explain the circumstances to the stipendiary magistrate on the following morning. It was in consequence of this arrangement that no officer of the battalion attended the Police Court.

Crimean Pensioners

Mr. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, in view of the fact that the present pension the men who served in the Crimean War are in receipt of is inadequate for their support, he will consider the advisability of giving them an increase sufficient to enable them to live outside the workhouse.

Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER: All those in receipt of small pensions, who are in necessitous circumstances, are now being granted special increases provided that they have either been wounded or discharged for disability, or are at the present time suffering from a disability clearly due to their military service.

Chinese Labour in the Transvaal Mines—Powers of Chinese Consul.

Mr. J. A. PEASE (Essex, Saffron Walden): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the proposal of the Chinese Minister mentioned in [Cd. 2026 2], that a Chinese Consul should have power to visit the Transvaal mines and make representations to the authorities respecting the well-being of the immigrants was acceded to by His Majesty's Government; and if this right is included among those granted to the officer whose appointment is provided for by Article VI. of the Convention signed on 13th May; or, if not, whether this proposal was waived by the Chinese Minister.

The SECRETARY of STATE for the COLONIES (Mr. Lyttelton, Warwick and Leamington): Article VI. of the Convention represents the arrangement finally arrived at in this matter. The Chinese Consul or Vice-Consul in the Transvaal will have all the privileges and facilities in the discharge of his duty of protecting the interests of his countrymen which are accorded to other Consuls, and the note to the Convention shows that every care has been taken to secure the appointment of Consuls of experience and standing.

Mr. J. A. PEASE: Are the Chinese representatives satisfied with that position?

Mr. LYTTELTON: I understand so.

Chinese Labour in the Transvaal.

Mr. SEYMOUR ORMSBY-GORE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether Chinese labourers under the Transvaal Ordinance can undertake work of a class in which hitherto white men have been engaged.

Mr. LYTTELTON: I stated some months ago that Chinamen would be excluded from work of a class in which white men had hitherto been engaged. I adhere to that statement, and it is given effect to in the Ordinance under penalties of £500 or two years imprisonment in default of payment. It follows, therefore, that white labour cannot be displaced by the introduction of Chinamen. On the contrary, a larger opportunity for the employment of white men will be afforded.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar): Is it not a fact that the gangers or overseers over the Kaffirs are at present white men. Will it therefore be competent for Chinese to act as gangers?

MR. LYTTELTON: I do not profess to have any exact knowledge of the precise conditions obtaining now in the mines, but every employment in which the Chinese are permitted to engage is subject to the limitation that it has not hitherto been the employment of white men.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): On whom is the fine imposed or the imprisonment inflicted? Is it the Chinese labourer who is to be fined?

MR. LYTTELTON: With all respect to the right hon. Gentleman, I can hardly think that he is in very much doubt on the subject. Section 31, Clause 5, of the Ordinance says that any person who employs these labourers, otherwise than in unskilled labour, in the exploitation of minerals, shall be liable to a fine not exceeding £500, or in default of payment to imprisonment for a period not exceeding two years.

MR. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): Did not the right hon. Gentleman state clearly in the House yesterday that Chinamen would be employed as overseers?

MR. MARKHAM: I beg to ask whether the right hon. Gentleman is aware that no British miners in the Rand can speak the language of the natives employed in the mines, and that all ganging work in the mines has been exclusively carried out by white men; and whether the right hon. Gentleman will inquire of Lord Milner what construction his legal advisers place on the terms "ganger" and "mine-overseer," which are both found in the schedule of occupations closed to Chinese labourers, seeing that a large number of British miners will be unable to find employment which they otherwise would find if Chinese gangers were not allowed to do that class of work.

MR. LYTTELTON: The Question only reached me a short time ago. I cannot profess to have any exact knowledge as to the exact conditions of employment in the mines. I think the hon. Gentleman will see that the inquiry he suggests is unnecessary because Chinamen can only be legitimately employed under the Ordinance provided that they are not employed in work that white men have hitherto been engaged in. Anything that can make that clear I shall be glad to do.

MR. JOSEPH WALTON (Yorkshire, W.R., Barnsley): May I ask whether the employment of Chinese labourers is not absolutely restricted to unskilled labour, and whether in the right hon. Gentleman's opinion the work of a ganger is a form of unskilled labour.

MR. BAYLEY (Derbyshire, Chesterfield): Are the gangers in the mines going to be Chinamen or white men?

MR. LYTTELTON: If gangers hitherto have been white men, they will be white men in the future. It is impossible for me to say from my own knowledge the exact conditions of labour that prevail. I should imagine that there would be cases in which, when Kaffirs came up from a considerable distance, speaking different languages, an intermediary would be employed to interpret the orders, and in the case of a black man being employed for that purpose now it would be competent for a Chinaman to fulfil the office. If, however, a white overseer does the work at present, it would, of course, be competent only for a white man to do the work in future.

Transvaal Finances.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies what is the latest information he can give in regard to the financial position of the Transvaal; and what are the figures of actual revenue and expenditure of the current year up to date, and the estimated revenue and expenditure for the balance of the current year.

MR. LYTTELTON: The latest estimate for the current year ending 30th June, was received by me in a telegram from Lord Milner, dated 4th June, and gives Transvaal revenue £4,430,000; Transvaal local expenditure, with Supplementary Estimates, £3,660,000; surplus £770,000. But this surplus is entirely absorbed by the deficit on the Intercolonial Budget. I have not the actual figures up to date; the financial position will be shown in greater detail in the Papers which I am presenting shortly.

Transvaal Dynamite Duties.

MR. MARKHAM: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he will lay upon the Table a letter, dated 11th July, 1902, addressed by Mr. Goldring, Secretary of the Transvaal Chamber of Mines, to the Colonial Secretary, praying that a duty of 5s. to 7s. 6d. per case should be imposed to assist the De Beers Company and the local factory in the manufacture of dynamite; also all letters before the war from the same association protesting against any dynamite monopoly being permitted by his Majesty's Government; and whether he proposes to adopt the free-trade recommendations of the Transvaal Concessions Commission of which he was Chairman.

MR. MARKHAM: I beg also to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention has been drawn to the statement made by the Chairman of the National Explosives Company at the ordinary general meeting, on 31st May, that this British company, as also other British manufacturers, had been excluded from the Transvaal market owing to the import duty of 6s. 3d. per case levied at the coast in the interest of the De Beers and Modderfontein factories; whether he will now cancel this monopoly provisionally sanctioned in 1902 by the Member for West Birmingham, seeing the effect of the duty has lost the largest dynamite market in the world to British manufacturers.

MR. LYTTELTON: I will answer the two Questions of the hon. Member on this subject together. I have seen the statement made by the Chairman of the National Explosives Company, but I am not prepared to admit that British manufacturers have been excluded from the Transvaal markets by the import duty, inasmuch as a certain proportion of the dynamite used in the Transvaal comes from sources outside South Africa. The recommendations of the Concessions Commission, of which I was Chairman, were in general terms and did not imply absolute free trade in dynamite, which indeed would be inconsistent with the general fiscal policy of the Transvaal. The matter is an extremely complicated one, and there are many contradictory statements as regards the comparative advantages or disadvantages of the different sources of supply. I have not yet been able to satisfy myself as to the true conditions. I have had interviews with representatives of both sides, and I have recently received further statistics, which are now under my consideration. Until I can announce a final decision, which I hope will be in a short time, there would be no advantage in my laying any Papers on the subject.

Transvaal Gold Mine Profit Tax.

MR. WHITLEY (Halifax): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies when he will be able to present the Papers relating to the method of assessing the gold-mine profit tax in the Transvaal.

MR. LYTTELTON. I propose to lay financial Papers shortly, which will contain the Papers referred to.

Finance of the New Colonies.

MR. WHITLEY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he will lay upon the Table the original and the revised Estimates of the Transvaal and Orange River Colonies, and of the Inter-colonial Council for the year ending 30th June.

MR. LYTTELTON: These Estimates will be included in the financial Papers to be laid shortly.

MR. WHITLEY: Will the financial Blue-book be laid before the Colonial Vote is taken?

MR. LYTTELTON: I hope so.

No British Mission to Kabul.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry S.) I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether a British mission is to start for Kabul at an early date; if so, can he state what the objects of such mission are; and whether it is to be of a peaceful character.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): The answer is in the negative.

New Indian Province Administrators.

MR. SCHWANN (Manchester, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India what is the number and annual cost of the European officers now and usually employed in that portion of the new province beyond the Indian frontier recently described by His Excellency Lord Curzon as stretching from Gilgit to Beluchistan.

MR. BRODRICK: Eighty-one military officers and seven political officers are employed in Chitral, Dir, and Swat; the Khyber; the Kurram; and Waziristan, which are the portions of the North-West Frontier Province mentioned in Lord Curzon's statement to which the hon. Member refers. The salaries of these officers are approximately 673,900 rupees per annum. To these must be added three police officers with the Samana Rifles whose salaries aggregate about 21,000 rupees per annum.

Mr. Tilak's Case.

MR. SCHWANN: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India if he will state whether the Government of Bombay referred Mr. Tilak's case to the police for investigation; whether the report of Mr. Brewin, the investigating officer, was forwarded to Mr. Tilak; will he explain why, after receiving that report, the Government appointed a special magistrate and a special prosecutor to deal with the case, instead of leaving it to be dealt with in the ordinary course of law; and will he place upon the Table the Government's orders upon the report together with the report.

MR. BRODRICK: As I explained in replying to the hon. Member on the 14th and 26th April last,† I have no information regarding this case beyond what is contained in the newspapers; but I will transmit the hon. Member's Question to the Government of Bombay for such observations as they may have to make.

East Africa—Alienation of Territory.

MR. CATHCART WASON: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he has received any remonstrances against the proposed alienation of territory in East Africa from settlers there, or any from officials that he can disclose to the House.

*THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Earl PERCY, Kensington, S.): Remonstrances against alienation of territory in East Africa could only be based on a misconception of the intentions of His Majesty's Government, for as I have more than once informed the hon Member no alienation of territory is contemplated.

MR. CATHCART WASON: May I point out that the noble Earl has not answered my Question whether any remonstrances have been received? Can the noble Earl say that?

*EARL PERCY: I cannot say for certain. Remonstrances against alienation have appeared in the Press, and may have been sent to us, but no alienation is contemplated.

MR. CATHCART WASON: A mere quibble of words.

Transvaal War Contribution.

MR. WHITLEY: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, in view of Lord Milner's recent statement regarding the finances of the Transvaal, he proposes at an early date to call on the guarantors to underwrite the £10,000,000 which should have been paid in January last towards the promised war contribution.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): As regards Lord Milner's speech I must refer the hon. Member to the Answer which the Secretary of State for the Colonies gave to a Question addressed to him yesterday;† but there is nothing in any report of that speech which I have seen to lead me to think that the present would be a suitable time for the issue of the first instalment of the War Contribution Loan.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxxxiii., 1194.

† See (4) *Debates*, cxxxv., 1062.

Mr. WHITLEY: Can the right hon. Gentleman give no indication that he has a hope of receiving this contribution at an early date.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I have no reason to abandon the hope of receiving the contribution, but I am quite unable to give any indication of the time when the issue of the loan will take place.

Mr. WHITLEY: Is there any hope of receiving it this year?

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I have answered the Question.

Tests of High Explosives.

Mr. MARKHAM: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department will he say what are the tests required before placing high explosives on the permitted list for use in the coal mines of this country, and whether he is aware that one, if not more, of the explosives on the permitted list emits a flame on explosion; and seeing the danger constituted thereby to the lives of persons in mines where such explosives are used, will he say what steps he proposes to take.

*The **SECRETARY of STATE for the HOME DEPARTMENT** (Mr. Akers-Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's): Before an explosive is placed on the permitted list it is tested at the Home Office Testing Station at Woolwich. The conditions of the test and the standard required to be reached are set out in an official memorandum, of which I shall be happy to send the hon. Member a copy if he desires to see it. As regards the latter part of the Question, it was recently reported to me that flame had been seen when a certain explosive on the permitted list was fired. I directed a special inquiry to be made, and experiments were carried out, the result of which was to show that the flame seen when the explosive was fired was not such as to constitute a source of danger. I shall also be happy to let the hon. Member see a copy of the memorandum prepared on the subject of these experiments in March last, after the inquiry above alluded to.

Mr. MARKHAM: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that one particular explosive gives off a long flame? I saw it only last week. It is like gas. Under these circumstances, will he make further inquiries?

*****Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS**: Yes, I will see whether there is any reason to make further inquiries.

Treatment of Habitual Criminals.

Mr. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he will lay upon the Table of the House the communications which passed between his Department and His Majesty's Judges in reference to the treatment of habitual criminals.

*****Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS**: The communications which passed between the Home Office and His Majesty's Judges in this matter were confidential, and I do not think that it would be desirable to lay them on the Table of the House. The quotation given by my hon. friend the Under-Secretary was not from the Judges' report, but from a private note from the Lord Chief Justice discussing certain points in the drafting of the Bill. There is, therefore, no obligation to lay it on the Table, but I may say that the passage quoted is a postscript to the letter and is complete as quoted.

Irish Railway Servants and Benefit Societies.

Mr. LUNDON (Limerick, E.): On behalf of the hon. Member for the St. Patrick Division of Dublin, I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that Irish railway companies make it a condition of their service that all employees shall join the benefit societies managed by the company; and whether, seeing that this condition discourages membership to the Amalgamated Railway Servants' Society, he will consider the advisability of taking steps to prevent this interference with these men's liberty.

The **PRESIDENT of the BOARD of TRADE** (Mr. Gerald Balfour, Leeds, Central): I have no information that the Irish railway companies make such a condition as the hon. Member refers to. The matter does not appear to be one in which the Board of Trade could intervene in the manner suggested.

Grant to the Meteorological Council.

MR. DALZIEL: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he will lay upon the Table of the House the Report of the Committee appointed to inquire into the expenditure of the grant to the Meteorological Council.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY (Mr. VICTOR CAVENDISH, Derbyshire, W.): Yes, Sir. The Report will be laid to-day.

Motor Car Regulations.

MR. GARDNER (Berkshire, Wokingham): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he proposes to make regulations in accordance with the recommendations of the Departmental Committee on Motor Cars; and, if so, whether, before framing them, he will ascertain the opinion of the county councils upon those recommendations.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. WALTER LONG, Bristol, S.): I shall be happy to consider the representations which any county council may wish to make on the recommendations of the Departmental Committee. The representations should be made promptly, as regulations on the subject are now in preparation.

Motors in the Parks.

MR. CATHCART WASON: I beg to ask the hon. Member for Chorley, as representing the First Commissioner of Works, if he can now state what steps have been taken to check furious driving of motor machines in the parks and roadways under his control.

LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley): Under the new regulations the speed of motor-cars on the roadways referred to is limited to ten miles an hour. The road north of the Serpentine is closed to motorists.

DR. FARQUHARSON (Aberdeenshire, W.): I beg to ask the hon. Member for Chorley, as representing the First Commissioner of Works, whether the attention of his Department has been directed to the invasion of Hyde Park by motor cars, which dash wildly along, interfering with the convenience and safety of those who use the crowded thoroughfare, and impairing the quality of the air by dust and the fumes of petroleum; and whether, by prohibition or restriction, he can protect the public from the growing nuisance.

LORD BALCARRES: The answer to the first paragraph is in the affirmative. Under the new rules the speed of motor-cars in Hyde Park is limited to ten miles an hour, and the First Commissioner hopes that this may prove sufficient to protect the public from the nuisance of which the hon. Member complains.

Astley Abbotts (Shropshire) Postal Arrangements.

MR. HUNT (Shropshire, Ludlow): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether, in view of the fact that there is no post or telegraph office in the parish of Astley Abbotts, Shropshire, with a population of over 600, and that the inhabitants on an average live about or more than three miles from any post or telegraph office, he could see his way to allowing a post and telegraph office to be set up there.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westhoughton): I will have inquiry made on the question of establishing a post and telegraph office at Astley Abbotts, Shropshire, and will communicate the result to the hon. Member. May I ask that more notice should be given me privately of Questions such as this, as it is obviously impossible in the short notice given to make inquiries sufficient to enable me to answer fully.

Sunday Pay of Adult Messengers in the Belfast Post Office.

MR. SLOAN: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether, in view of the fact that certain adult messengers at Belfast are paid extra for work performed on Sunday while others of the same staff are obliged to work on Sunday without remuneration, he will consider the advisability of extending the extra pay to the latter.

LORD STANLEY: I will make inquiry and communicate with the hon. Member.

Use of Public Elementary Schools for Political Meetings.

MR. HUNT: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether he will consider the desirability of issuing a circular directing the managers of all schools receiving Government grants to allow their use for the meetings of any political Party.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir WILLIAM ANSON, Oxford University): The control and use of school premises out of school hours rests, in the case of council schools, with the local education authority, and, in the case of voluntary schools, with the trustees or owners of the building, and in neither case with the managers appointed under the Act. The Board see no reason in either case to interfere with the discretion of the persons or bodies in whom such control is vested.

Irish National School Plans.

MR. BOLAND: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can now state what decision has been come to with reference to the proposed new plans for national schools.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): I have nothing at present to add to my reply to the similar Question the hon. Member addressed to me on the 12th May.†

Valentia Ferry.

MR. BOLAND: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state why no progress has been made with the providing of a suitable ferry at Valentia, county Kerry, in view of the statements made by him when the Marine Works (Ireland) Bill was under consideration.

MR. WYNDHAM: No specific undertaking was given by me to expend money on a ferry at Valentia. Three proposals for works at this place have been made, namely, (a) the construction of a jetty at a cost of £800, (b) the extension of the existing slip and provision of a breakwater at a cost of £8,000; and (c) the provision of a railway pier on a new site involving an expenditure of £14,000. The Knight of Kerry does not consider the smaller work suitable, and is not prepared, I understand, to accept it. The plan of the second work was referred to the Great Southern and Western Railway Company in May, 1903, and has not since been returned.

Irish Outdoor Relief Regulations.

MR. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that under present regulations a board of guardians in Ireland is not enabled to grant outdoor relief to any person in occupation of more than a quarter of a statute acre of land, though such person may be disabled or even certified as unfit for removal to the workhouse hospital; and whether he will recommend the Local Government Board to instruct their auditors not to surcharge on the guardians any relief extended in deserving cases outside the present limitation.

MR. WYNDHAM: The prohibition to grant outdoor relief to persons in occupation of more than a quarter of an acre of land is a statutory one, and the Board has no power to instruct its auditors in the manner suggested. In cases of sudden and urgent necessity a relieving officer is empowered to afford outdoor relief until the next meeting of the board of guardians, irrespectively of the quantity of land held, and such relief may be renewed if new circumstances arise under which there is a necessity for affording relief promptly and immediately.

French Fishing Boats in the Kenmare River.

MR. BOLAND: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that during the past three weeks three large French fishing boats have been fishing every night in the Kenmare River, to the detriment of the local boats, who are afraid to shoot their nets anywhere in the vicinity because of the risk of being run down; whether he is aware that H.M.S. "Skipjack" has only visited the coast once within the same period, and then confined its attention to hunting up fishing boats to see whether the letters and numbers on their sails were perfect, although steam trawlers had frequently been within the limit; and whether steps will be taken to protect the local fishermen.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxxxiv., 1176.

MR. WYNDHAM: Only two cases of alleged fishing by French boats in territorial waters have been brought under the notice of the new Department. These were investigated by the commander of H.M.S. "Skipjack," but no definite proof of the commission of the offence was obtainable. The Department's cruiser has frequently patrolled this part of the coast for vessels engaged in illegal steam trawling. Two such vessels have been captured, and proceedings have been instituted, and are now pending.

MR. MACVEAGH: Does the right hon. Gentleman undertake that the fishing tackle seized shall not be sold back to the trawlers from which it was taken?

***MR. SPEAKER**: Order, order! That does not arise out of the Question.

Blocking Motions.

MR. J. A. PEASE: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he is aware that on the Notice Paper of the House there are thirty-four Notices of Motions for which no days have been fixed, and that in consequence of such Notices the House is prevented from discussing the following amongst other questions: Fiscal Reform, Preferential or Protective Duties; the Misgovernment in Macedonia or in the Congo State; the War in Tibet; the Reorganisation of the War Office; Asiatic Labour, the Rate of Mortality in South African Mines, or the Recruitment or Payment of Chinese Indentured Labourers; the Public Health; Military Training or Compulsory Military Service; Local or any other Taxation; the system of putting down blocking Motions; and the necessity for an immediate dissolution; and what steps the Government propose to take to promote liberty of debate on such subjects.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I suppose the hon. Gentleman by the phrase in his Question, "the House is prevented from discussing" questions, which he proceeds to enumerate, means prevented from discussing them on Motions for the adjournment of the House as definite matters of urgent public importance or on Motions for adjournment for the holidays.

MR. J. A. PEASE: I admit that some questions can be discussed in Supply.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The first example which the hon. Gentleman gives is Fiscal Reform and Preferential Duties. That has been discussed nine days in the present session. The second example is Macedonia. That has been discussed twice in the present session and can be discussed again this afternoon. The third is the War in Tibet. There was a long discussion on that on 13th April. The next is the War Office. A discussion on that will be in order, I imagine, on the Vote for the Secretary of State for War. The next is Asiatic Labour, which has been discussed on five days in the course of the present session. Then there is the Congo, which, I believe, is to be discussed on the Vote to be taken this afternoon. Then there is Public Health. We have had the Local Government Board Vote discussed a whole evening. Military Training or Compulsory Service might, I suppose, be incidentally referred to in connection with War Office reform—with the Army reforms to be explained by the Secretary of State for War. Then there is Local Taxation, on which subject a Valuation Bill has been introduced. There remains the necessity of an immediate dissolution. It will be seen that most of the subjects about which the hon. Gentleman complains have not only been discussed, but in most cases have been rediscussed and re-rediscussed. As to the remainder, while many have been discussed or are subjects for the discussion of which opportunities still remain, they are not questions which by any possibility could be brought up on a Motion for the adjournment of the House. In these circumstances it appears to me that the hon. Gentleman's enumeration of grievances is not one which is likely to support his case.

Mr. PIRIE (Aberdeen, N.): With regard to the question of fiscal reform, which the right hon. Gentleman says has been discussed nine days, may I ask whether it is not the case that the Government have always shirked the plain issue on that question?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I will not argue whether this is an accurate description of what has occurred or not, but I will make two observations. In the first place an adjournment debate never can raise a plain issue, and that is the grievance of hon. Gentlemen opposite. Then, if the Government have avoided a plain issue on nine occasions, they are not likely to be taken in on the tenth.

Mr. J. F. HOPE (Sheffield, Brightside): Is the Prime Minister aware that another discussion on the fiscal question is blocked by a Motion standing in the name of the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I am not aware of that fact, if it is—as I have no doubt it is—a fact, but it does not seem to me to touch the general question with which I have been dealing.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he will agree to the appointment of a small Select Committee to consider the difficulties which have arisen from the placing on the Paper of Motions designed to prevent the House from considering definite and urgent questions of public importance.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: The hon. Gentleman who asked the last Question was good enough to bring forward instances of the nature of the grievance, and I do not think an examination of them greatly strengthens the case of the right hon. Gentleman. But I quite admit that in my opinion, at all events, there ought to be no limitation of the powers of the House to discuss anything upon a Motion for adjournment for the holidays. I do not think any limitation ought to exist, provided a reasonable arrangement be made for the duration of such debates. I am prepared to put down on the Notice Paper my idea of a Rule which would meet, I think, legitimate desires on both sides of the House. As regards the wider question whether we should alter the Rule about blocking Notices preventing discussion on matters of urgent public importance, I do not think that can be treated by itself. I think we should have, in addition, to discuss whether the present Rule allowing the adjournment has been abused, and, if it has been abused, whether it is capable of amendment. I think we should also have to consider whether there are no other abuses of the existing Rules of the House—as an example I may mention taking a division upon the Question put from the Chair by the Chairman of Committees that he should report an agreed Resolution—whether that also ought not to be discussed. But I think it would perhaps be sufficient for the present needs of the case if I put down my idea of an Amendment which would remove such legitimate grievance as exists in respect of Motions for adjournment for the holidays.

Major SEELY (Isle of Wight): Is the right hon. Gentleman not aware that in point of fact the abuse of Motions for the adjournment to which he refers is very largely owing to the existence of these blocking Motions. It is essential——

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, Order! The hon. Gentleman is now proceeding to argue the question.

Mr. MACVEAGH: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that these blocking Motions are occasionally put down after consultation with the Government Whips?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I never inquire into matters of consultation either on the other side of the House or on this.

Mr. WEIR: A policy of retaliation.

Trade Disputes Bill.

Mr. LUNDON: On behalf of the hon. Member for the St. Patrick Division of Dublin I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether the Government intend to give facilities for the Third Reading of the Trades Disputes Bill this session.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The Bill in question has not yet reached the Committee stage so that it is premature to consider the question of giving facilities for the Third Reading.

Licensing Bill.

MR. MACVEAGH: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he can state if the consideration of the Licensing Bill will be continued on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It will not be taken next week.

MR. MACVEAGH: Is there any foundation for the announcement in the *Standard* that the Bill has thus been postponed on account of Ascot?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It is postponed because we are going to take the Scotch Education Bill.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: What will be the Supply next Thursday?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I think it would probably be convenient to the House to take the salary of the Secretary of State for War in Committee of Supply on Thursday next. I must not be considered as giving an absolute pledge, but I have very little doubt that is the arrangement which will be made.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Does that mean the Army Estimates generally? Does the right hon. Gentleman contemplate going on with the discussion upon the statement which will be made, without any opportunity being given to Members of previously considering the statement?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I will consider that point. I understand that what the right hon. Gentleman desires is that there should be no immediate discussion upon any plans laid before the House by the Secretary of State for War.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: That there should be a further discussion.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Yes, and therefore other business might go on immediately. I will consider whether it would not be convenient, as being very germane to the first Vote, that I should put down the secretariat to the Defence Committee; but perhaps I may be allowed to consider that matter.

MR. WHITLEY: May I ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, in view of the trade interests concerned, he will be able to take the Finance Bill soon? There is a great deal of anxiety in the country on it.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I agree, and I am very anxious to get on with the Bill. I will state more on Monday.

NEW WRIT.

New Writ for the Borough of Devonport, in the room of John Lockie, esquire (Chiltern Hundreds).—(*Sir A. Acland-Hood.*)

REGISTRATION OF CLUBS (IRELAND) BILL.

Reported, with Amendments, from the Standing Committee on Trade, etc.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 204.]

Minutes of the Proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed. [No. 204.]

Bill, as amended (in the Standing Committee), to be taken into consideration upon Friday, 17th June, and to be printed. [Bill 223.]

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES (METRIC SYSTEM) BILL [LORDS].

Read the first time; to be read a second time upon Wednesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 225.]

NEW BILLS.

PORT SANITARY AUTHORITIES EXPENSES BILL.

"To remove doubts as to the legality of certain payments by Port Sanitary Authorities," presented by Mr. Plummer; supported by Sir Joseph Dimsdale, Sir James Joicey, Sir Henry Seymour King, Mr. William Lawrence, Mr. Herbert Lewis, Mr. MacIver, Sir Edward Reed, Mr. Robson, Sir John Barrington Simeon, Mr. Charles Wilson, and Mr. Yerburgh; to be read a second time upon Thursday next, and to be printed. [Bill 226.]

CARRIERS ACT (1830) AMENDMENT BILL.

"To amend the Carriers Act, 1830," presented by Mr. Bill; supported by Mr. Arthur Heath, Mr. Bond, Mr. Strutt, and Mr. Trevelyan; to be read a second time upon Thursday, 23rd June, and to be printed. [Bill 227.]

PUBLIC ENTERTAINMENT BILL.

"To amend the Law relating to Public Entertainment," presented by Captain Jessel; supported by Mr. William Frederick Smith, Sir George Fardell, Sir Robert Mowbray, Dr. Macnamara, Major Jameson, Mr. T. P. O'Connor, Mr. Crooks, and Mr. Shackleton; to be read a second time upon Monday, 20th June, and to be printed. [Bill 228.]

STREET TRAFFIC (REGULATION) BILL.

"To provide for the Regulation of Traffic in Streets," presented by Mr. Shackleton; supported by Mr. Bell, Mr. Crooks, and Mr. Henderson; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 22nd June, and to be printed. [Bill 229.]

SUPPLY [12TH ALLOTTED DAY.]

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. JEFFREYS (Hampshire, N.) in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1904-5.

CLASS II.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum not exceeding £35,771, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Department of His Majesty's Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs."

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) said the Foreign Office Vote was generally used for the purpose of a general discussion on the political situation of the country in regard to other Powers. They had had a very recent debate in which most of the topics which could be safely dealt with in the present state of Europe were discussed. He referred to the debate on the Anglo-French Convention, and although there might be questions asked in the course of that afternoon in regard to the action of the Government in Macedonia and Armenia, it was not his intention to deal with more than one subject that day. He doubted very much whether, in the present state of Europe, with the Russo-Japanese War proceeding, and with our engagement towards Japan, it was wise that the House of Commons should attempt to discuss these subjects. At all events, he should refrain from doing anything of the kind. It might easily cause harm, it could do no good, and silence seemed, under the circumstances, to be the best course at the present moment. But there was a matter which they discussed last year, on a separate Motion, for a full day in the House of Commons, and in regard to which they carried a unanimous Resolution. Since that time four Papers had been laid, one of them having been circulated only that morning, showing the course which the Government had pursued in consequence of the agitation which led up to the passing of the unanimous vote to which he had referred. The subject was, of course, the affairs of the Congo State, a matter on which public feeling in this country had been excited for many years past to an extent that had rarely been known. It was a matter on which public opinion had been still further excited by the revelations which the Government had had itself to make in consequence of the action it promised last year. The Motion of last year was passed on 20th May, when attention was called by several hon. Members to the treatment of the natives in the Congo State, and to the responsibilities of this country in connection therewith. In the course of that debate complaints were made that the *Concessionaire Régime* constituted a breach of the treaty conditions under which the Congo State was established, inasmuch as the effect of what was going on was to lead to the actual depopulation of the country under circumstances of the most horrible cruelty. The country was being worked out as a merely temporary possession, and it was not being kept going for the benefit of future generations. These were the allegations which were made on the occasion of the debate in the House of Commons, when it was resolved that measures should be adopted to abate the evils prevalent in that State. That debate was followed by the issue of a Government Paper, Africa No. 10, 1903, which contained a note from the Congolese, Government which was, he thought, intended for the purposes of the debate because it was dated two days before the debate actually occurred. In that Paper there was a dispatch to which he must draw special attention. He did not like to make disagreeable comments upon any of our public servants, but he confessed that he was a little disappointed that it should have been thought his duty by Sir Constantine Phipps to state that the correspondence led him to the conclusion that—

> "If the operation of the Commission has not been so effective as might have been anticipated the fault is due not to any deficiency of conception or absence of energy on the part of the central Government."

Now, he believed that statement to be entirely contrary to the facts and he regretted, therefore, to find it in the dispatch. It appeared to him to be contradicted by the whole of the information which the Government had subsequently themselves, upon official information laid before the House of Commons. The next Papers that were circulated were circulated at the beginning of the present session, one bearing the date Africa 14–1903. This was a dispatch written by the Government in consequence of the Motion made in that House, and in consequence of the Resolution passed by the House, and in that dispatch the Government spoke in all moderation; in fact, the dispatch was couched very much in the terms used in the House of Commons by the Prime Minister when he accepted the Resolution. In it the Government pointed out in the Note to the Powers that new instances of cruelty were proved, and they referred to the possibility or probability that those instances of cruelty might be connected with the system of administration itself. They said that it was reported that the method of obtaining men for labour had often but little difference from that employed formerly to obtain slaves. It was an authoritative statement that new slavery existed. and that compulsion in regard to bringing in produce was exercised by irresponsible native soldiers uncontrolled by Europeans It was suggested that that was vouched for by men whose testimony could be relied upon. It was pointed out that vast territories were held by companies closely connected with the State, and the Note quoted the opinion of Mr. Casement, as a Consul of wide African experience, to the effect that even in the treatment of British subjects by the Congolese Government there had been revealed instances of cruelty, oppression, and horrible administration, and that as that occurred in the case of foreigners protected by their own Government, it might be assumed that the state of affairs was far worse in the case of the natives. It was said further that the Reports of Mr. Casement, the Consul, gave evidence of cruel maladministration and ill-treatment, that the Congo stations were shunned, the only natives seen being soldiers and prisoners, and then the Note went on to speak of the depopulation of that part of the country. Now the defenders of the Congo State, who, he was happy to state, were almost exclusively foreigners and not Britons, were too apt to suggest that the original state of that country was horrible in the extreme, and that, however bad things might be at the present moment, at all events they constituted a great improvement on the past. That however, was not the opinion of this administrator of wide African experience He continually returned to the statement that things were getting far worse, and that large native trades which formerly existed had been destroyed, that the people were being driven across the borders, and that the country was becoming void of population. He would ask those who took an interest in the African question to refer to the high authority of Lady Lugard in her recent paper on "West African Negroland" as showing that the allegation that the state of things in former times was far worse was directly contrary to fact.

In the first Papers issued this year, Africa No. 1, 1904, Lord Cromer, in a dispatch written with that weight and authority which characterised everything that came from his pen, pointed out the extraordinary contrast which struck him when he passed from the Anglo-Egyptian sphere to the Congolese territory. He confirmed the statement that the natives shunned the Congo stations, and said there was no wonder the people should fly from the Belgians, for he was informed that the soldiers were allowed full liberty to plunder. The whole administration lived in the country by forced labour and by forced supplies of food. If these things were allowed close to our frontiers in places continually under the inspection of our officers what might they expect in the interior? Lord Cromer's view was absolutely confirmed by Consul Casement's experience on the other side of the State—a thousand miles away. As Lord Cromer told them, there was a total absence of ordinary administration such as obtained in every other colony in the world—the whole administration, from the Governor-General down to the cannibal soldier, was living in the country by forced supplies.

Now he came to our own Consul's Report, which had been foully attacked and ought to be defended, seeing he was selected by the Government as an official of great experience to make the investigation, in consequence of a Resolution passed by the House, which was largely responsible for bringing this Congo State into existence, in the name of civilisation. The Report might be divided into two parts—one describing things he saw with his own eyes, and the other conveying statements on what might be deemed to be responsible authority. For instance, a most incredible statement was made by a Swedish missionary, since unfortunately dead, and anyone who saw that gentleman must have been convinced that he was stating facts. Incredible as it might seem, the evidence compelled the belief that cannibal troops were employed by the State and lived as cannibals. It had been said that the late General Gordon employed cannibal soldiers, but, at any rate, he did not ration them on human flesh. There was a horrible story reported on good missionary evidence of cannibal soldiers asking a white officer to give them an old woman to eat, and he told them to take her, and the soldiers cut her throat, divided the body, and ate it. In describing the things he had seen with his own eyes, Consul Casement said he found steady deterioration and depopulation all the way up the river from the beginning of his journey; what were formerly large and flourishing trade centres he found ruined and laid waste; the inhabitants were forced to supply food for the officials even in Leopoldville; labour was enforced under cruel punishment, and the men were in this way prevented from fishing and trading. If men refused they were seized and sent away for long distances from their homes, and this was the condition of things long before the rubber districts were reached. On page 29 they had a description of how the depopulation of the country was proceeding. There were people who had walked from 120 to 150 miles, and when asked why they had fled they replied that "they had endured such ill-treatment at the hands of the Government officials and soldiers that nothing had remained but to be killed for failure to bring in rubber or to die in their attempts to satisfy the demands." That was why they had fled from the rubber districts. Many in their attempts to get away had been shot down and killed. Again, on page 30 they had a narrative showing how largely native trade had been destroyed. Occasionally Congolese punitive expeditions were employed because the people failed to bring in the required food supply. It was urged that we occasionally sent punitive expeditions, but they were of a totally different character. Heaven knew he had little sympathy with punitive expeditions, but we had never had one producing the results described in this

Report. A native sentry belonging to a different tribe and speaking a different language was placed in charge of a village. He was armed with a rifle and supplied with a number of cartridges which he had to satisfactorily account for. He was responsible for seeing that the stores and food supplies were got in, and the more quickly it was done the better he liked it. So he used force to compel the people to work; life was held cheaply and the district was quickly depopulated. On page 31 it worked out thus—a "Government official" makes war on a town "for failing to bring in its fixed food supply. Many prisoners are taken and the women distributed as slaves." One man told Mr. Casement that he had three given to him, of whom one escaped. This was the new slavery—there was unmitigated slavery in connection with these expeditions.

The Consul's evidence in relation to the *Domaine privé* confirmed that of Rev. A. E. Scrivener, a Baptist missionary, that that the manufacture of baskets for the conveyance of produce in the Government steamer by river and to Europe was enforced upon the natives by flogging. The people were frequently flogged for inability to complete the tale of baskets or food. Several (including a chief) showed scars, and Consul Casement added that "the statements were not untrue was confirmed by his visit to the *Domaine privé* store." The district brought home the moral here, that we were not justified in pretending to ourselves that these evils existed only or mainly in connection with the Concessionaire Companies. They evidently existed still more markedly in the *Domaine privé* and the *Domaine de la Couronne*. In the *Domaine de la Couronne*, handed over to the administration of three persons, two of whom were equerries to the King, a revenue was derived from illegal taxes. In this connection they had the evidence of the Rev. A. E. Scrivener, a Baptist missionary who travelled through the country of the *Domaine de la Couronne* from July to September, 1903. He told them the condition in which he found that great tract of 30,000 square miles, and Consul Casement's Report confirmed his statement on page 29. Consul Casement alluded to a letter from the Rev. John Whitehead given on page 60, "Notes on Refugee Tribes." Again, pages 63-4 described horrors which existed in the *Domaine*. The rev. gentleman saw a great number of skeletons, and the people told him that—

> "When the soldiers were sent to make us cut rubber there were so many killed we got tired of burying."

Mr. Whitehead continued—

> "All combined to convince me that during the last seven years this *Domaine Privé* of King Leopold has been a veritable hell upon earth."

There was one matter in relation to which the denial of the Congo Government was peculiar. Mutilation was a common mode of punishment, and though the officials declared that in recent years they had put down the practice, there was evidence that it continued, nor was it surprising that it should be so when authority was enforced by barbarous armed sentries in the native villages, who would be likely to inflict this form of punishment. They had described on pages 34 and 45 terrible cases of mutilation. In one a lad of sixteen, another a boy under six, a third a boy between six and seven, and a fourth boy, whose arms were cut off or shot through. One lad had been twice shot through the arm at short range, shattering the bone and burning the flesh. In consequence of this mutilation, flogging, and shooting, the people "fly at the approach of steamers. Villages are emptied of all human beings." Mr. Casement states that he had entered villages which he had visited in happier times and where he had been courteously received, and found them deserted, and at last when he discovered some of his former friends they told him that they ran away from the white man's steamer because of the treatment they got from the white men. In the despatch which was circulated that morning, "Africa No. 7," Lord Lansdowne had a passage on the subject of mutilation. In that despatch, dated 6th June, there was an interesting passage—

> "With regard to the question of mutilation His Majesty's Government note with interest that the Congo Government are aware that Mr. Casement is not alone in his opinion that such atrocities occur."

He need not detain the Committee with the evidence of the people escaping from this horrible system to foreign territory. On page 36, "Africa No. 1, 1904" it is stated that—

"In the past they escaped in large numbers to the French territory, but many were prevented by force from doing this, and numbers were shot in the attempt."

And on page 39 there was full detail of life in villages ruined by State forced labour. There was one case which was only one of thousands, which was personally investigated by Consul Casement—

"A widow came and declared that she had been forced . . . . to sell her daughter, a little girl . . . . about ten . . . . I found . . . . on returning . . . . that the statements made with regard to the girl were true . . . . The girl had again changed hands and was promised in sale to a town whose people are open cannibals. Through the local missionary . . . . ."

Consul Casement bought the child out of slavery, and sent her back to her mother. Now this was done with such knowledge that it amounted to connivance on the part of the authorities. In all those cases the people who were not killed were sold as slaves through the action of a Government which professed to have been established to put down slavery. Afterwards Mr. Casement went to the concessions area, where the same system was followed. Page after page of the Report dealt with the rubber and sentry system. On page 46 Mr. Casement gave his examination of one of these rough sentries. He got hold of this man because he was able to talk freely. Most of them were too stupid—being mere brutes; but this man told Mr. Casement all the facts. He asked the man—

"Why do you catch the women and not the men?"

And the answer was—

"If I caught the men who would work the rubber? But if I catch their wives . . . . the rubber is brought in quickly."

On page 47 the matter was fully followed up, and on page 48 Consul Casement described how he himself saw men captured by those sentries, dragged on the ground and lodged in what were called *Maisons des Otages*. There was a House of Hostages on every station where the people were taken and terrified by the risk of flogging, death, or slavery into acting as hostages that those over whom they had authority should bring in a sufficient supply of rubber. This was explained on page 50, after he had talked the matter over with white officers—

"The truly recalcitrant man who proved enduringly obstinate in his failure to bring in his allotted share of rubber would in the end be brought to reason."

In his general remarks on this system at page 59, Mr. Casement said—

"The officers could not but feel themselves bound to consider the profitable exploitation of indiarubber as one of the principal functions of Government."

Just let the Committee consider what that meant. This rubber was not obtained from plantations, but from the virgin forest where the vines were cut and allowed to bleed to death. The rubber was obtained by this horrible means of torture and slavery; the vines died out; the country became a barren desert and the population disappeared. These wretched people had been exterminated for this temporary profit, and the exploiters passed to another district where the same practices were followed with corresponding results. In their first despatch the Government summed up Mr. Casement's statements on page 83 as "a grave indictment and need no comment." But in "Africa 7," circulated to-day, and which was chiefly filled with the Congolese reply to Consul Casement's statements already published in Belgium and here, and which was not worth much examination, at page 40 Lord Lansdowne in his dispatch of 19th April, which he thought was a weak despatch and which he regretted to see in that volume, asked that—

"A searching and impartial inquiry will be made into the allegations against the Administration . . . . and that if real abuses or the necessity should be thereby disclosed, the central Government will act as the necessities of the case demand."

That was the situation when the Government got their information not only from Members of this House, missionaries, and others, but from Mr. Casement's Report. Surely enough had been disclosed and we need not have been put back where we were many years ago. He fully admitted, however, that on page 61 there was an excellent dispatch in which the Government, going back on their former dispatch, used these words—

"The inquiry promised is no doubt intended to be of a searching and impartial character, and His Majesty's Government hoped that they would before now have received some indication of the measures designed to carry out this intention. In the peculiar circumstances . , . . strict impartiality will hardly be attributed to an investigation conducted . . . . solely by the officers of the State or by the agents of the concessionaire companies."

That, he was sure, would be the view of the Committee. That was a wise and consistent attitude for the Government to take up. Now, since the publication of Mr. Casement's Report, the Caudron case had occurred. This man, who was a Congolese official, and a coloured British subject from a neighbouring colony, also employed by the State, had been convicted and sentenced to a long term of imprisonment. Their sentence was slightly reduced by the Court of Appeal, the members of which were of opinion that their responsibility was to some extent covered by the direct orders of the Congo Government itself. The Court of Appeal asked for the production of the orders under which these men had acted and that demand of the Court was refused by the Congo Free State Government. The Court stated that although they believed that these persons had acted under the orders of the State, they nevertheless found that the acts they had committed were so horrible that no orders could justify them, and therefore, though they reduced the term of imprisonment, they retained a very heavy penalty upon them. The result of the Caudron case was that King Leopold had written a letter to the Governor-General of the Congo Free State in which His Majesty ordered him, after the manner of the Chinese Government, to search out everywhere the people who were responsible for the atrocities and bring them to justice. But these people acted under the orders of the Government of the King, and it was impossible for the Government not to know the system by which these enormous profits were gained. The impartial evidence obtained as to the system pursued in the *Domaines* was sufficient to show that. He did not think the position of the Congo Free State would be strengthened before the eyes of Europe by that letter of King Leopold.

He had hitherto dealt entirely with the humanitarian aspect of the question. He now came to the trade aspect, in which Liverpool and Manchester were naturally much interested. The concessionaire system of trade, the depopulation of the country, the destruction of the local trade —all meant the destruction of the international trade which the Congo Free State had pledged themselves to promote, and which was, in Africa, necessary to the happiness of the people. The monopoly system was destructive of the happiness of the people, which depended on general trade being permitted to be practised. Now when the Congo Free State was founded it was for two objects—in the name of the principles of humanity and with special reference to the principle of full liberty of international trade. The late Sir Henry Stanley delivered a most eloquent address on 18th September, 1884, on the subject in favour of the Congo Association just before it was officially brought into existence—it changed its name only after the Berlin Act—in which he said—

"We are international. . . . We have laboured for all nations. . . . Come with your cottons and woollen stuffs and trade freely. . . . We are not traders ourselves. We do not understand it, but you do. We will not ask what your nation is. . . . We wish to secure equal rights to all and the utmost freedom of commerce. . . . Whatever concessions . . . we gained in that basin we wish to give away to every *bonâ fide* trader."

Everyone admitted that there was the most frightful falling off in the Congo. Personally, he believed that the world had never in modern times seen such horrors as were perpetrated in the Congo State, except perhaps under Spain in the West Indian Islands and Peru, and nothing like them had ever been seen under any Government which professed to be civilised. This country was responsible both from the humanitarian side and the trade side. The Foreign Office assured the Manchester and Liverpool Chambers of Commerce that in any event freedom of trade would be retained. The late Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs said—

"We had a *locus standi*. . . The Congo State had entered into obligations towards us."

They themselves had stated as individuals that the Congo State was the creation of Europe at the Berlin Conference. The Congo State, however, asserted that it was the creation of treaties made some years before the Berlin Act; and that the first of those treaties was with the United

States. The Congo State, however, did not change its official name until 1st August, 1885, after the Berlin Conference. But if King Leopold took that view, and that the United States had recognised the Congo State as a sovereign State with a flag, before the Berlin Conference, then the Government ought to be asked to go outside the signatory Powers of the Berlin Act and to appeal to the United States. Having regard to the opinion expressed by the President and the Secretary of State in the United States on those matters, he believed that such an appeal would be pregnant with good results. As regarded the trade side he would leave that to the Lancashire Members. This country was now at war with Tibet nominally for the protection of trade; and if British trade were treated in Morocco as it was in the Congo he believed every British warship in the Mediterranean would be ordered to the African coast. As regarded the humanitarian side, they were, however, all concerned. The responsibility which rested on those Englishmen, some of them Members of the House, who brought the International Association into existence was a very heavy responsibility indeed. In face of the facts which were now officially admitted, he asked the House whether the time had not come when they should sweep away all the difficulties which stood in the way, and force the Government to take stronger action than mere words in dispatches to deal with this horrible scandal.

*Mr. AUSTIN TAYLOR (Liverpool, East Toxteth) said that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Forest of Dean had so exhaustively dealt with the serious condition of things in the Congo Free State that he hesitated to add anything to the luminous and lurid description he had given. Perhaps, however, as one of the representatives of a city which was largely interested, not only in trade in the Congo Free State, but also in the French Congo, he might be allowed to say a few words on this important question. The system prevailing in the Congo Free State, and to a certain extent in the French Congo, had been described in words which he would quote and which seemed to him to sum up the crude method of dealing with tropical countries that had been adopted by France and Belgium. An area of a couple of thousand square miles was marked off on a map of Africa and then the company obtaining the concession was told—"Gentlemen, we, the Government of this African country, grant to you and your associates everything of commercial value which grows within the area marked on the map of that country. You will, of course, make it convenient to pay the native some little trifle for his self-imposed labour in bringing you what you require. Gentlemen, good day; and never forget that we seek only one thing—the moral and material advancement of the dark races." The result of that system was that instead of those countries being administered for the benefit of the natives, in the first instance, and secondly, as was originally promised on the founding of the Congo State, for the commercial benefit of those who desired to trade with the natives when they developed in their capacity as trading animals, there was a system of enforced slavery under which the concessionaire sought not the good administration of the country, not the elevation, moral or spiritual, or even material, of the natives, but the exploitation of the forests and the acquisition of rubber, one of the most important and most profitable of commodities, second perhaps only to gold in the steadiness of the demand and the enormously lucrative character of the profit obtained by those who traded in it. The head of the Government by armed violence supported them in their determined efforts to obtain this most valuable commodity, for the attainment of which they expropriated the native from any freehold he might have in the soil, and they wrung out of the soil, and all that grew upon it, everything of value to the utmost farthing, for commercial purposes, not, be it noted, for the benefit of other countries who desired to trade with the Congo State, but for their own benefit as sellers of this commodity in the European market, and also for the benefit of a Government which was not ashamed to share in the nefarious methods by which that commodity was secured. He would cite the very remarkable circular issued from Boma by the Governor-General in respect of the necessity of acquiring rubber in the greatest quantity. The circular was addressed to the commissioners of districts and the chiefs of zones, and referred at very great length to the depreciation in the quality of the rubber, and to the necessity of keeping up the quality, and also improving the quantity. It concluded with these remarkable words, which he thought were worthy of attention as coming from the Governor-General, and which might be taken as indicating what he considered to be the primary object of those to whom the circular was addressed—

> "I may add that the value of rubber, even when free from all admixture, has gone down in every market for some time past. Territorial chiefs must, therefore, not only remove the two causes of loss which they can eliminate, but they must try also to neutralise the third by making unceasing efforts to increase production to the extent laid down in the instructions."

There they had the Governor-General stimulating the authorities in those countries not for the benefit of the natives, not as a justification for the existence of this European Administration, but for the material profit of those engaged in trade, well knowing that it would lead to the degradation and bitter oppression of the natives. He did not desire to go at any length into the methods by which the natives were compelled to accept forced labour, and to suffer degradation in the process. He should like to quote an extract from the evidence of Lord Cromer. Whatever might be said with reference to Lord Cromer, he would be recognised by the House and by the country as a man who would not commit himself lightly to an expression of opinion in regard to the administration of native States. He said—

> "It appears to me that the facts I have stated above afford ample and sufficient justification of the spirit whch animates Belgian administration, if administration it can be called. The Government, so far as I could judge, is conducted almost exclusively on commercial principles, and, even judged by that standard, it would appear that those principles are somewhat shortsighted."

He should also like to quote an extract from the Memorandum issued by Lord Lansdowne. The Congo Administration had endeavoured in self-justification to asperse the dealings of England with other native races. He was not prepared to contend that we were altogether free to bring these charges against the Free State without laying ourselves open to something that might appear at the first blush as a retort, but Lord Lansdowne, in his Memorandum, summed up with absolute truth and perfect clearness the difference that existed when he said that the native under the British system knew the fixed amount of his obligation, and, once discharged from it, was at liberty to seek where he would labour or leisure; but the Congo labourer might not even leave his village except as a fugitive, and was a close bondsman to his endless tasks. English administration, even if they went a long way back, could not be charged with any such abominable system as that of which details were set forth in the Memorandum on the Congo State. There was no Court of Appeal in Belgium. The public opinion of Belgium had declared through the proper channel that the Congo Free State was a foreign State, in regard to which it had no power of intervention. He was driven to the conclusion, therefore, that the only remedy was for the public opinion of Europe, and particularly of this country, to bring into force the clause of the Convention under which the Free State was founded. Consul Casement mentioned in his Report that 72,000 cartridges were issued in that State, and at the end of three years, when more were asked for, it was stated that all of those received had been used "in the production of rubber"—signifying that they had been utilised to terrorise or slay the natives who did not bring in enough of that commodity. This country could not allow such a state of things as existed in the Free State to go on without protest; and without something which he hoped would be more efficient than mere protest. The British Government had, indeed, moved in the matter, and he was confident that feeling on both sides of the House was unanimous that strong and effective measures should be taken to ameliorate the condition of things. He would not dwell upon that side of the question relating to the French Congo, in which the trade of Liverpool was perhaps even more interested than that of the Free State. The commerce of this country, although opinion differed as to its state at the moment, was sufficient to excite the envy of foreign nations, but the sufferings of those unfortunate natives appealed to something higher and nobler than that commercial instinct which had done so much to make England what she was, and the Government, in any steps they might take in the interests of the moral and spiritual regeneration of the dark races, might rely on the intelligent and ardent support of all citizens of all classes and creeds throughout His Majesty's dominions.

*MR. EMMOTT (Oldham) insisted that the interest taken by this country in Congo affairs was due rather to the humanitarian than to the trade point of view. He admitted that in the French Congo Lancashire commercial interests were placed in an unfair position, and that, he trusted, would be remedied, but in the Congo Free State there had never really been any international trade, and British merchants had not taken any steps in the direction of opening up business. Therefore it was from the humanitarian rather than any other point of view he should address the Committee. After the debate of a year ago, His Majesty's Government issued to the Powers a Note, dated 8th August, asking them to consider whether the system now prevailing in the Independent State of the Congo was in accordance with the Berlin Act, and in various of the replies received from the Congo Free State to that and other communications there was a tone of veiled insult against the people, the Government, and the Consul of this country. The apologists of the Congo State had constantly asserted that in this attack the English Government were actuated by interested motives. For instance, the following passage occurred in the reply of the Congo Free State to the Note of 8th August—

> "It is worthy of remark that this campaign dates from the time when the prosperity of the State became assured."

In the same paragraph it was stated—

> "As the State gave increased proof of vitality and progress, the campaign became more active, reliance being placed on a few individual and isolated cases, with a view to using the interests of humanity as a pretext, and concealing the real object of a covetousness which, in its impatience, has betrayed itself in the writings of pamphleteers and in the speeches of Members of the House of Commons, in which the abolition and partition of the Congo State has been clearly put forward."

What State in its senses would desire to take up this *damnosa hereditas* of the Congo Free State? It was, however, important that this country should repudiate any idea of aggression or of "grab" in the matter. If it was true, as no doubt it was, that the attack had grown in force since the revenues of the Congo Free State had increased, it was due to the fact that the system in vogue in that country was of such a character that it inevitably led to abuses, and the increase in the alleged development of the country had therefore inevitably led to more abuses. Information about those abuses from time to time filtered through to Europe, and this country had felt obliged to enter its protest. After all, the Congo Free State was formed, in the first place, to prevent the great nations of Europe from grabbing portions of the territory, and it was founded on a free-trade and humanitarian basis.

There were two points in regard to which the Government had given the Congo Free State ground for taunting them with having put forward a case they could not prove. In the Note of 8th August, they drew the attention of the Powers of Europe to the fact that the time of the British Consul—

> " . . . has been principally occupied in the investigation of complaints preferred by British subjects, and he has, as yet, been unable to travel into the interior and to acquire, by personal inspection, knowledge of the condition of the enormous territory forming his district."

The Congo Free State jeered at the Government for not sending proof of the outrages upon British subjects. He understood that the particulars required had now been sent out, so that the point was met, so far as the Congo Free State was concerned, but the House of Commons had a right to know what those complaints were. As to the outrages on natives, the Note of 8th August stated—

> "Moreover, information which has reached our Government from British officers in territory adjacent to that of the State tends to show that notwithstanding the obligations accepted under Art. VI. of the Berlin Act, no attempt at any administration of the natives is made, and that the officers of the Government do not apparently concern themselves with such work, but devote all their energy to the collection of revenue."

With regard to that, the noble Lord had stated that the information had not been sent out to the Congo Free State as it was of ancient date and was not considered worth sending.

*The UNDER-SECRETARY of STATE for FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Earl Percy, Kensington, S.) was understood to say that that applied to both cases.

*Mr. EMMOTT said the following passage occurred—

> "With regard to the application, renewed in the Notes, for previous Reports from British Consular officers, it is necessary to explain that these Reports, though forwarding testimony upon which reliance could apparently be placed, were founded on hearsay, and lacked the authority of personal observation, without which His Majesty's Government were unwilling to come to any definite conclusion unfavourable to the Administration of the Congo State. Moveover, some of the Reports are of old date; the Congo State had admittedly been very active in pushing forward occupation of the country, and it would be unjust to bring forward statements regarding a condition of affairs which may have entirely passed away."

Four times the Congo Free State had taunted the Government with making statements which they were not ready to back up by proof, and in that matter the Government had certainly placed themselves in a somewhat false position. It was a pity they made the statement if they were not going to back it up by proof, but, having made it, they ought to send the particulars to the Congo Free State, and publish them to the House of Commons. In the reply of the Congo Free State, dated 14th May, 1904, it was stated—

> "The Government of the Congo State regrets that His Majesty's Government does not deem it necessary to communicate to it the other previous Consular Reports to which Lord Lansdowne's despatch of the 8th August, 1903, alluded. As was stated in the Notes of 12th March last, these Reports possessed the interest of having been written at a date anterior to the inception of the present discussion."

The defenders of the Congo Free State were trying to make Europe believe that these Reports did not exist, and that, having made statements which they had not the material to back up, the Government had sent a Consul into the country to make a Report justifying those statements. That, of course, was absolutely false, but its falsity would be best proved by the publication of the Reports to which the Government had referred. He could not prove what he now hinted at, but he would suggest that some of those Reports were so bad that if they were published the Government would be asked why they had not taken measures at an earlier date to deal with the position. There must have been many other Reports from British Central Africa, Northern Rhodesia, and elsewhere, and he strongly urged the Government to produce those Papers. Since the debate of 20th May the fullest confirmation had been received of every statement then made. It was to be found in Lord Cromer's Report, in Consul Casement's Report, in the statement of Messrs. Scrivener and Weeks, and in the horrible Yaudjali massacre. It had been proved that cannabalism, organised murder, mutilation by order, and depopulation of certain districts existed; that unreasonable demands for food were made to such an extent that the natives themselves were dying of starvation; that excessive demands for rubber were made, and that women were imprisoned in chains. In the Caudron case, the accused was charged with having murdered 122 men in cold blood; he was adjudged guilty of murder and of raiding for rubber; and it was admitted that the only grievance against the men whom he had murdered was that they had not collected sufficient rubber to satisfy the authorities. The ordinary defence of the Congo Free State was that these things only occurred here and there, that the people were punished for them, and the crimes did not occur again. This crime occurred in the Mongala district, the same district where the massacres of 1900 occurred, and it was under the same company. In 1900 Lothaire, the murderer of Stokes, who was appointed by the King as director of this company after he had murdered Stokes, was in charge. It was thought that when these concessionaire companies were displaced these evils would cease, but that was not so, for evils as great occurred in the *Domaine privé* and the *Domaine de la Couronne.* Many of these companies were not really commercial companies at all. Consul Nightingale, on page 42 of the last Blue-book, said—

> "The same abuses may go on in the Katanga country as have hitherto gone on in the Mongala district, unless most stringent measures are adopted to prevent them."

He also says—

> "There is a decree published, giving powers to the agents of the Katanga Company to collect the State taxes."

What was the Katanga Company? It was a company from which the State received two-thirds of the profits. More than half its directors were State officials and the president was the Finance Minister of the State. This was a question of the whole system. These things were part of a system which was not so much a matter of monopoly as of the absolute destruction of trade. It was not a system of trade at all. Where there was trade there was barter. Trade meant that European merchants wished to exchange their goods for the raw produce of Africa. But in this case the merchant, who is really the State, says, "This land is mine, and the black native must gather the produce. I pay what I like for it, and this black man is to work as long as I wish for the collection of produce." That was not trade at all, but slavery. The black was not going to do this work for nothing, and it meant if he was dealt with in this way that force would have to be used. They committed these horrible atrocities in order to force the collection of rubber. Mark what followed. This black native was not being paid for what he collected, and he could not buy, because he had nothing to buy with, and therefore the trade did not exist at all. Look at the accounts of the Congo Free State. There were none so remarkable in the world, because they showed all exports and no imports. He invited hon. Members who believed that an excess of exports over imports implied prosperity to study the trade statistics of the Congo Free State and they would have their eyes opened. They must look this question in the face. Who was profiting by it? The State and the King principally. Whose interest was it that this state of things should be kept up? Why, the interest of the State and the King. That was a plain statement of the case. This system was wrong and he believed illegal, but whether illegal or not it was fundamentally, wholly, and unutterably bad. This was a danger for which they might have to pay very dearly, for when they were strong enough to raise a great black rebellion in that part of Africa it might affect the dominions of every other Power in negro Africa. What could be done? They must have a root and branch reform and a return to trade methods. By such a system the present head of the Congo Free State would lose. No half-hearted inquiry under the supervision of the King would be of any use, and they wanted something very different. The point was what should be done? They wanted a policy. What they wanted was another European Conference on this question. With regard to that, he associated himself with his right hon. friend in suggesting that they should ask America to help them. He believed that America was ready to help them. Other countries should be made to believe that they were in earnest, because if they did not think this country was in earnest they would not listen to them. Another suggestion made was to refer the legal point to the Hague Tribunal. He should be very glad to see a legal judgment given on that point, but he was afraid that it would not carry them very much further. In order to effect a reference they must both agree to refer and agree upon the terms of reference with the Congo Free State. There would be some difficulty in doing this. Again they could not separate the commercial from the humanitarian aspects of the question, because they were indissolubly interrelated. Suppose after inquiry by the Hague Tribunal—the specific verdict was against them, were they going to stop this agitation? He maintained that that would not affect it in the least. On the other hand, if the verdict was in their favour it would be a mere expression of opinion by the Hague Tribunal, requiring further action at the hands of the Government.

He supported his hon. friend opposite as to Consular Courts. They ought to protect all their citizens, for that power was reserved in the Treaty of 1884, and yet Mr. Stokes was foully murdered. Rabinek, an Austrian subject, was arrested, illegally tried, and sentenced to one year's imprisonment, when one month was the utmost imprisonment permissible for the offence he was charged with, and, as he appealed against this sentence, he was brought down for the case to be retried at Boma, but he died on the way. The treatment of British subjects had been such that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham stopped recruiting in our own neighbouring colonies. They had 2,000 British coloured subjects in this part of the world and the only safeguard they had was the Congo Judicature, which was removable at pleasure. Cyrus W. Smith, who was imprisoned after the earlier Mongala massacre, told them that 100 women who were illegally imprisoned died of starvation on his hands because the State authorities did not give him food to keep them alive. He imprisoned them under orders, and if he had not done this he would have been shot. Take the case of Silvanus Jones. He had seen cruelties perpetrated and had remonstrated. He had been told to catch natives and he sent people out, and one of his boys shot a woman. He reported the affair, and he was sent for to Boma to be tried, but he had no knowledge of the charge against him and no chance of getting counsel to defend him although he had money to pay with. He agreed that men who had committed such wrongs should be punished, but this man said he was innocent. He said he was innocent, but whether he was guilty or not he was not defended and he had not a proper trial. If they had their own Consular Courts they might get at the truth of these things, and they ought to insist upon such Courts. The Congo Free State might protest, but these horrible and detestable crimes justified them in demanding Consular jurisdiction. He did not ask the Government to rush in this matter, but they should make up their minds what they were going to do, and then invite other Powers to follow suit. This was to him the one clear step, if they could not get a conference, by which they would do something to protect their own subjects and bring the Congo Free State more or less to its senses. He apologised for the length at which he had detained the House, but his excuse was that he took a very keen interest in this matter, and it did not lend itself to very short treatment. He hoped the noble Lord would give him a sympathetic answer to this question of Consular jurisdiction.

SIR JOHN GORST (Cambridge University) thanked the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean for the very clear and moderate statement he had laid before the House of Commons and the country. He did not wish to dissociate himself from a single word the right hon. Gentleman had said. He had expressed the opinion of those who had taken an interest in the Congo question. He wished also to thank His Majesty's Government for the practical steps they had taken since this matter was under the consideration of the House last year. He hoped the Government would persevere in the course they had undertaken, and he assured them that in their efforts to secure a better state of things in the Congo they would have the support, not only of the House of Commons, but the unanimous and cordial support of the people of the country. It was the one subject on which they were all agreed. The weighty words in the despatch of Lord Cromer, which had been read to the House, were written by him when he had two examples of administration on opposite banks of the Nile. The example on the one side was that of the new, humane, and enlightened policy of Empire which, at all events in theory, was observed in the administration of all the territories of the British Empire. On the other side he had the example f the old, barbarous, and wicked principle of Empire upon which the Empires of ancient times were carried on, and which lasted in modern times down to the Spanish conquest of America. The principle upon which Lord Cromer, in Egypt, the Viceroy of India, and all the great pro-Consuls of the British Empire, now proceeded in the treatment of native peoples was that the resources and riches of the State belonged to the inhabitants of it, that the civilised power in its administration sought only to develop those resources for the benefit of the people, and that the welfare of the people was the sole object for which the administration was carried on. The gain this country derived from administration of that kind was restricted to the advantages of trade. We believed, and believed justly, that if we made India or Egypt prosperous, that indirectly gave an enormous advantage to our own people. They were customers for the goods and commodities which we made, and they paid for the goods and commodities they bought from us by the produce which they raised and exported to our country. But the old principle of Empire was that the riches and resources of a country belonged to the people who conquered and occupied it, that they had a right to exploit the country for their own advantage, and that the wretched people over whom they assumed the duties of administration were only to be treated as slaves, and only to be employed in enriching those who had undertaken the administration of the country. When once that principle was adopted, as it appeared to have been in the Congo Free State, all the rest flowed from it. There was an example of that kind in the Spanish conquest of America, where the riches of the country were appropriated by the conquerors, and where the people were enslaved and ultimately exterminated. They had to work in gold mines to enrich those who had undertaken the administration of their country. In the Congo, where the same principle seemed to have been adopted, the rubber was regarded as the property of the Belgian State or colony, and it was exploited solely for the benefit of the Belgian monarch and those to whom he had granted concessions. The natives were employed in exporting this wealth to Belgium. If that principle was once adopted all those atrocities which had been described to the House were the natural consequences which flowed from such a method of administration. Without the evidence either of missionaries or Consuls it might be expected that horrors and wickedness of that kind would spring up in a State so administered. The evidence which the right hon. Baronet had laid before the House only confirmed the proposition that from a wicked system of Empire like that the natural consequences were following.

They all trusted His Majesty's Government in this matter. With considerable confidence they left it in the hands of Lord Lansdowne and the Government. But there had been two very distinct suggestions made in the course of this debate on which he should like to say a word. In the first place, he most heartily joined himself with the suggestion made by the right hon. Baronet and by the hon. Member for Oldham, that they should, if possible, in this matter act with the United States. He dared say that the Government would tell the Committee whether anything had been done in that direction. One reason for expressing that wish was that the interest of the United States was identical with our own. The interest of the United States was one of commerce and trade, and, as far as could be judged, they were in the administration of native States adopting principles analogous to those which we adopted. They had the same sense of responsibility and the same feeling that the trust they had undertaken must be exercised for the benefit of the people. He had no doubt that in any matter of this kind we should find the statesmen, Congress, and people of the United States sympathising with the views which were common to our own country. The United States had a peculiar responsibility in regard to the Congo because they were, he thought, the first Power to recognise it as an independent and autonomous State. The other suggestion which had been made and which he confessed he had a little more doubt about, was that if we were driven to it we should subject the Congo to Consular jurisdiction. Consular jurisdiction was not a very good thing for the State against which it was exercised. Those who had taken part in the administration of Egypt knew very well that it produced a sort of confusion which was always mischievous. It was, however, the claim which civilised countries made for the protection of the lives and property of their subjects in barbarous countries. To make such a claim on the Congo would be to advertise to the whole world that we regarded the Congo as a barbarous State. He did not know that we ought to do so now. If they would harken to the representations of His Majesty's Government, and make satisfactory reforms, well and good; but if they refused to listen, and persisted in the wicked course which had been described, it would be right to, at all events, threaten them with treatment as a barbarous country, and to intimate that if they did not reform their Courts and provide regulations for the administration of justice, which would ensure justice being done to British subjects living within the territory, we should be compelled under these circumstances to invite the United States and other civilised Powers to imitate our example, and to exercise the right given under the convention of setting up Consular jurisdiction. That was no, doubt, a subject which would receive the careful consideration of His Majesty's Government. All the Committee could ask them to do was to persevere in their efforts, and to make use of every expedient which the resources of civilisation might give them for the amelioration of the state of things in the Congo, with reliance that Parliament and the country would support them.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL (Yorkshire, Cleveland) said that a year ago he brought forward this question of the Congo in the House, and none of the evidence then adduced had been in any degree shaken. He thought that some reference should be made to the Burrows libel case. A certain Captain Burrows published a book, in which he freely denounced the Administration of the Congo Free State; and a libel action was brought against him by two Belgian officers, who had been mentioned in the book. The action went in favour of the Belgian officers. Those who had been interested in exposing the Congo case knew that the Burrows book was unreliable, and that the allegations in it could probably not be supported. None of them, therefore, had ever quoted a single word from that book as evidence in favour of their case, or from the statements of any discharged servant of the Congo Free State. He fully agreed with the right hon. Member for Cambridge University that those individual atrocities to which so much attention had been called were the inevitable outcome of the financial exactions of the Congo Free State. They could not have forced labour for trivial remuneration, heavy taxation, forest guards left uncontrolled, without frequent outrages and constant punitive expeditions. The result of this system was two-fold: to the companies and to the State it had given enormous profits, which had been eminently satisfactory to them. Take the *Compagnie Anversoise* one of the chief concessionaire companies, in which the State, in other words King Leopold, held half the shares. Its capital was 1,700,000 francs, and its profit in 1902 was 1,080,000 francs. The A.B.I.R. Company had a capital of 1,000,000 francs, and the profits for four years amounted to 12,000,000 francs. In this company also the State held half the shares. The effect on the natives of this financial system had been abundantly proved. Mr. Casement, who was sent by the British Government to make an impartial investigation, was an official with twenty years experience in Africa—a gentleman of the highest standing and reliability, and whose good faith even the Congo Free State had not ventured to challenge. He had written a Report of sixty pages, full of the most specific and definite instances of cruelty and oppression. There were the cases of mutilation, including several which had come under Mr. Casement's own notice.

Only last night he was speaking to an English missionary, who had been on the Congo for many years. On one occasion that missionary came down to the river bank, and saw a canoe which had just come in in charge of a number of soldiers. In the canoe was a basket containing fifty human hands, which had been freshly severed from natives by these Congo Free State soldiers. The Congo Free State had most remarkable explanations for these mutilations. A boy who was brought to a distant station by a Belgian official, far away from his friends, was badgered into declaring that he had lost his hand while he was hunting. He saw a wild boar, and endeavoured to seize it by the ears, but the boar turned round and ate his hand off! Then *La Tribune Congolaise*, a semi-official organ of the Congo Free State, explained these dreadful mutilations by saying that the natives suffer from cancer in the hands and that the loss of the hands is merely the result of an ordinary surgical operation! His hon. friend had referred to the Mongala case, in which three Europeans and a British coloured subject in the employ of the *Compagnie Anversoise* were implicated and were condemned for certain crimes. What were these crimes? The killing of 150 persons and cutting off sixty hands, crucifying women and children, cutting off the heads of men and nailing them on the palisades of the village; shooting a native with a revolver; killing a native chief; shooting twenty-two women and two children of the village of Momba, and shooting three women outside it; shooting a native soldier; imprisoning sixty women and putting them "in the chain," where all but five died of starvation. These men appealed against their sentence, and among other extenuating circumstances which secured a marked reduction of the first sentence imposed on the coloured man, the Court of Appeal cited the following—

> "That it is just to take into account that, by the correspondence produced in the case, the chiefs of the concession company have, if not by formal orders, at least by their example and their tolerance, induced their agents to take no account whatever of the rights, property, and lives of the natives; to use the arms and the soldiers, which should have served for their defence and the maintenance of order, to force the natives to furnish them with produce and to work for the company, as also to pursue as rebels and outlaws those who sought to escape from the requisitions imposed upon them.

These men, in spite of the extenuating circumstances arising from the connivance of their superiors, were sentenced to long terms of imprisonment, but such is the rigour of the administration of the law in the Congo Free State that two of the men had been released after serving three years! Precisely a similar occurrence had taken place within the last few months. A man named Caudron was sentenced for crimes almost as gross Again, he pleaded extenuating circumstances and again the Court admitted the plea on the ground that he was authorised to commit these crimes by those having authority over him. He would quote one or two cases to show the extent to which impoverishment and depopulation had been carried out in these regions. On page 46 Mr. Casement says—

> "At a village I touched at up the Lulanga River, a small collection of dwellings, named Z, the people complained that there was no rubber left in their district, and yet that the La Lulanga Company required of them each fortnight a fixed quantity they could not supply. Three forest guards of that company were quartered, it was said, in this village, one of whom I found on duty, the two others, he informed me, having gone to Mampoka to convoy the fortnight's rubber. No live stock of any kind could be seen or purchased in this town, which had only a few years ago been a large and populous community, filled with people and well stocked with sheep, goats, ducks, and fowls. Although I walked through most of it, I could only count ten men, with their families. There were said to be others in the part of the town I did not visit, but the entire community I saw were living in wretched houses and in visible distress. Three months previously (in May, I believe) they said a Government force, commanded by a white man, had occupied their town, owing to their failure to send in to the Mampoko headquarters of the La Lulanga Company a regular supply of indiarubber, and two men, whose names were given, had been killed by the soldiers."

And Mr. Casement gave the case of a man and his family, living in three huts, who were required to pay in an amount of produce equal to £80 a year. In another district he said that—

> "The population of the lake-side towns would seem to have diminished within the last ten years by 60 or 70 per cent. It was in 1893 that the effort to levy an indiarubber imposition in this district was begun, and for some four or five years this imposition could only be collected at the cost of continual fighting. Finding the task of collecting indiarubber a well-nigh impossible one, the authorities abandoned it in this district, and the remaining inhabitants now deliver a weekly supply of foodstuffs for the up-keep of the military camp at Irebu, or the big coffee plantation at Bikoro. Several villages I visited supply also to the latter station a fortnightly tax of gum-copal, which the surrounding forests yield."

Each town, he estimated, was compelled to bring in this gum-copal to the value of £360 a year, for which they were paid in goods to the value of £10. There was also a large mass of evidence from the missionaries. There was the evidence, for example, of Mr. Weeks, who had been for twenty-three years on the Congo. In a letter that gentleman wrote on 30th November last, he said—

> "Last week I returned from spending eight days in the Bokongo, Bongondo and other towns below this, our station at Monsembe, and while there I learned of the killing by Mabata (which was the native name of a Belgian officer) and his soldiers of twenty-two men and women."

after giving the names of the victims—ten men, eleven women, and one girl—Mr. Weeks continued—

> "And what was the crime of which these unfortunate folk were guilty? They were behind in their taxes, and owed the State between them a few goats."

He went on to say that the natives were bound to supply goats for the table of the white officers, and that now all the goats had practically disappeared from the district. He gave the names of many cases where the people were actually compelled to sell their relatives and children into slavery to buy goats in order to provide the white officers with food. Another point asserted by the Congo Free State was that all the soldiers employed were Regulars, and never Irregulars not under control. A recent occurrence throws a remarkable light on this contention. On 28th November of last year, four British missionaries going down the river put into a village unexpectedly and found the Congo troops, under the eyes of two white officers, engaged in a horrible cannibal orgie. It was true that, on the complaint of the missionaries, the officers were arrested, and one had committed suicide.

There was abundant evidence that in despite of their treaty obligations the Congo Free State had failed lamentably to care for the moral and material interests of the natives, and to a large extent the origin of all these evils was the trade monopolies which the Congo Free State, in violation of the Berlin Act, had granted. In reply to remonstrances, the State explained that every one was free to buy or sell what he pleased—only it happened that the whole of the soil of the Congo State had been declared to be vested in certain companies or individuals; if the soil were vested in those companies or individuals the products of the soil were also vested in them; and, consequently, no one else could legally buy those products; they were told, however, that everything else they were quite free to buy. As there was nothing else there, the Congo Free State, by means of this subterfuge, completely defeated the avowed intention of the Powers at the time of the Treaty of Berlin. Not only was this a source of outrage on the natives, but it was also an invasion of legitimate British interests. British merchants had a right to claim that they should be permitted to trade freely on the Congo; and, not only merchants in England, but also merchants in British territories adjoining the Congo State. It should be remembered that the Congo State adjoined British territory at four separate points: in Northern Rhodesia, in British Central Africa, in Uganda, and in the Soudan. On all those frontiers trade was absolutely impossible between British subjects and the Congo Free State. That also gave this country a legitimate right to insist that this illegal system should be terminated. The Government suggested that this specific point should be put to the arbitration of the Hague Tribunal. The only point on which he did not agree with his hon. friend the Member for Oldham was with reference to the utility of that suggestion. It appeared to him most desirable that this suggestion of arbitration should be pressed; and he had little doubt that there would be a decision in favour of this Government; and then, as they believed, when they got rid of those monopolies they would also get rid, to a large extent, of the outrages on the natives which followed from them. He had sufficient confidence in the impartiality of the Hague Tribunal to believe that if this country were right, it would be judged to be right, and if it were judged to be wrong then they would have to proceed on different lines, and limit their movement to the humanitarian aspect of the question. The Congo Free State had refused to arbitrate. His Majesty's Government had not, however, pointed out—and he hoped they would—that there was another clause in the Berlin Act, namely Article 12, under which the signatories of that Act bound themselves specifically in case of any serious dispute to refer it to mediation or arbitration. Therefore, the Foreign Secretary might clearly point to that particular Article, by which the Congo Free State was bound, and claim as a right that this matter should be put to mediation or arbitration. The Congo Free State said that those were questions of sovereignty and internal administration which could not be properly arbitrated upon. But the great majority of cases now put to arbitration at the Hague Tribunal were questions of sovereignty and internal administration. Three of the four cases now pending or recently decided—the case of the claims of the Powers arising from misgovernment in Venezuela, the case between the United States and Mexico relating to some Church property in California, and the case between Japan on the one hand, and England, Germany, and France on the other with reference to a house tax in Japan—were all cases dealing with matters of sovereignty and internal administration; and the fact that this matter was also a question of sovereignty and internal administration by no means removed it from the category of international cases fitted to be arbitrated upon.

The proposed establishment of Consular Courts commanded the warmest approval of all those interested in this proposal. But that the Government should consent only to a mere inquiry would, he thought, be a most unfortunate outcome. There was once a member of the New Zealand Parliament who committed a bull which, although it was a mixed metaphor seemed absolutely to express the position of the Government in this matter much better than if a correct expression were used. He said—

> "In this case, sir, I think that the Government are trembling on the verge of a *cul-de-sac*."

In considering their assent to a mere inquiry as a solution of this matter, the Government were trembling on the verge of a *cul-de-sac*. It would lead nowhere, and would only prove—if it proved anything—what was already quite notorious. He sincerely trusted that the Government would press for a much more definite and complete measure of reform. It was often said that from the present Administration they might expect a spirited foreign policy. The phrase often meant a policy of reckless aggression; but there were occasions in which spirit was pre-eminently desirable in a Foreign Secretary; and this was certainly one of them. If the Government pressed this matter with more vigour, he was convinced that it would be supported by public opinion, not only in this country, but probably by public opinion in the United States also. The people recognised that it was intolerable that the Sovereign of the Congo Free State should be allowed to seize the native's land, to reduce him to slavery, to impoverish him by excessive taxation, to expose him to a *régime* of outrage and oppression, to shut out foreign trade, to tear up treaties solemnly made, and, when remonstrances were offered, to meet them with a smile and a shrug of the shoulders. It was not consonant with the duty or with the dignity of this country that the representations earnestly made should be permitted to be treated as if they were of no account.

*LORD EDMUND FITZMAURICE (Wiltshire, Cricklade) said he desired to say a few words on this question because it so happened that at the time the Congo Free State was called into existence he occupied the position in His Majesty's Government that was now occupied by the noble Lord opposite. At that time he took a very active part in the long and somewhat exciting discussions in this House in regard to what was to be the future of those regions; and he ventured to recall to the attention of the Committee what passed then, not merely to develop an argument of a purely historical character and interest, but because it had been already indicated in this debate that what happened then was of the utmost importance in regard to what was happening now with reference to the position of the Congo State. There was an extraordinary hypothesis which appeared to run through all the arguments put forward by the Congo State, and especially through those which emanated from the present Minister or representative, whichever he might be called, and that was that the Congo Free State was like any other State which formed part of the State system of the world. It was positively stated in the first place that the Congo State came into existence as a State long before the Berlin Conference. He ventured to assert that the Congo Free State—and he believed he was expressing the opinion of the whole House—was as much the creation of European law as any corporation in this country which might be created under an Act of Parliament was the artificial creation of English law. Without the Berlin Conference there would be no Congo Free State; and if the reasons which induced Europe to consent to the formation of the Congo Free State failed, and if the conditions of that international contract were not fulfilled, and especially were not fulfilled by the beneficiary of that contract, then, at any moment, Europe, which called the Congo Free State into existence, was entitled to dissolve that State. He ventured to go further and say, though he admitted it was a strong proposition, that any one of the signatories to the great document which settled Africa at Berlin in 1884, was also justified in bringing, before whatever tribunal was the proper one, notice of its intention not to be any longer bound by conditions which were not fulfilled. Further, he would venture to remind the Congo Free State how very easy it would be, if they persisted in what he ventured to call the insolent and insulting tone which permeated those documents, for Europe, or indeed for any State that chose, to practically put an end to its existence by sending a few ships to the mouth of the Congo. They had heard a great deal lately of the great weight of sea power; and the Congo Free State lay absolutely at the mercy of this country, or any other country which chose to say that it would occupy the capital at Boma in the name of civilisation. He did not hesitate to say that the documents which had been published were an insult both in substance and in tone.

He would venture specially to call attention to one particular passage, in which an attempt was made to introduce into the controversy that most odious of all arguments the *odium theologicum*. That was an attempt to show that this country and its agents were being influenced by religious motives because they were Protestants. The passage appeared on page 14 of the White Paper and was as follows—

> "Whether such was his intention or not, the British Consul appeared to the inhabitants as the redresser of the wrongs, real or imaginary, of the natives, and his presence at La Lulonga, coinciding with the campaign which was being directed against the Congo State, in a region where the influence of the Protestant missionaries has long been exercised, necessarily had for the natives a significance which did not escape them. The Consul made his investigations quite independently of the Government officials, quite independently of any action or any co-operation on the part of the regular authorities; he was assisted in his proceedings by English Protestant missionaries; he made his inspection on a steamer belonging to a Protestant mission; he was entertained for the most part in the Protestant missions; and, in these circumstances, it was inevitable that he should be considered by the native as the antagonist of the established authorities."

He had ventured to call attention to this, because nothing could be more abominable than the judicial murder of Mr. Stokes, especially the concluding passages of it, which took place in the Belgian Courts of Appeal, when every attempt was made the *odium cum theologicum* in a country where religious feeling runs high. Because Mr. Stokes was an Englishman and a Protestant many appeals were made to that Court, in order to prevent justice being done to the relatives of Mr. Stokes. The blood of Mr. Stokes still cried out from the ground. No adequate attempt was made at that time by the Foreign Office of this country to see that Mr. Stokes's case was properly supported to its conclusion. In his opinion the best counsel—some jurist conversant with all the ramifications of international law—ought to have been retained at the trial. It seemed to him there had been a failure of moral support and a failure of legal support of Mr Stokes' case in the Belgian Court. Then there was the terrible case of Rabinek, who was not a British subject, but was on a British ship. This man was not murdered in the off-hand way in which Mr. Stokes was murdered, he died on his way to Boma to take his trial, but, nevertheless, he was practically just as much murdered as Mr. Stokes. All this might be considered more or less idle lamentation over events that had occurred, but, as the right hon. Member for the University of Cambridge had very truly said, the Congo Free State had reached the point when it ought to be no longer recognised as a civilised State.

What we had to do, as he ventured to suggest, was, in the first place, to take advantage of everything there was in the Berlin Act to exert to the utmost the rights of this country against the Congo Free State, and also to assert, where we could, the international rights of Europe against the Congo Free State. His first suggestion was that we should insist on the establishment of Consular Courts. If we had been entitled to have Consular Courts in a country whose civilisation was not our civilisation, as in Japan, we were certainly entitled to have Consular Courts in the Congo Free State. The Committee was aware that one of the most important clauses of the Berlin Act of 1884 related to the policing and the navigation of the rivers of Africa. It was one of the principal objects of Mr. Gladstone's Government at that time to establish both on the Zambesi and on the Congo some sort of international control, similar to that found on the Danube and other rivers in Europe. Had the treaty which we negotiated with Portugal in 1883 been carried out it would have entirely altered the whole situation in Africa, because there was a saying in Africa that if an Englishman and a Portuguese were put in a boat together the Portuguese would do the rowing and the Englishman would command, and Europe was quite satisfied to put the Congo under Anglo-Portuguese control, and that would have served very well. But that Agreement was thrown out of this House. Then came the Berlin Conference, and an International Commission was substituted for the Anglo-Portuguese Commission and the Congo was placed under its control. When the British Government accepted the International Commission they were not thinking of a river Commission in the mere technical sense of the term, but believed with the other Powers that an International Commission would be of great use in establishing on the Congo the flag of civilisation, and that a Commission of that kind on that river would be a sign to all those who lived in that part of the world that civilisation was on the river. He had always regretted that since that time no attempt had been made to establish an International Commission on the Congo. He ventured to say that the Government should take every step they could for the establishment of an International Commission on that river.

This state of things which he had described could not fail to show this House and the country that we were facing a very serious situation, and when we remembered that this country by the great instrument which the Government had executed with France, which placed both countries on a friendly footing, each with the other he could not help thinking that they could not give the world a clearer sign of their amity than by making the restoration of law and order in this region the outward and visible sign of it. We owed this Congo Free State to the fact that in 1883–4 our relations with France were not so cordial as we could have wished. There was a good deal of rivalry between us; the French colonial tariff had been proclaimed and actually established in the not distant colony of the Gaboon. Such a tariff would have resulted in our trade and commerce being shut out of the Congo. The Belgians took advantage of the situation, and brandished in the face of a credulous world their magnanimous intentions as against the narrow intentions of France, and promised if they got in there should be universal free trade. The Government of the day were not quite so credulous, but they were overruled by this House, and if he desired any justification for the course then taken by the Government of Mr. Gladstone with regard to the future of these regions, he would find it in this Paper and the others which had been laid on the Table.

* **EARL PERCY**: I think the tone of the speeches this afternoon, and certainly their intention, has been favourable to the policy of His Majesty's Government. There has never been a policy of which it might be said as truly as of this one that it was the policy not so much of His Majesty's Government as the policy of the House of Commons. We have been reminded in the debate that that policy was adopted on the authority of a Resolution moved from the opposite side by the hon. Member for Cleveland and passed without a division last year, and that Resolution has undoubtedly been endorsed by the unanimous feeling of the country at large. It has been approved at meeting after meeting during the past twelve months, attended by men of every shade of political and religious opinion; and the indignation which has been expressed at those meetings has found its origin not in any prompting on the part of the Government—on the contrary, we have deliberately withheld our evidence until we could examine it carefully—but in the accumulated facts and horrible indictments which have been brought forward by missionaries, traders, and others who have been long resident in the Congo territories. I allude to this unanimity and spontaneity of opinion because it has an important bearing on the reply to our first Note, addressed to us by the Congo Government. That the Congo Government should not have acknowledged the truth of the accusations brought against them, that they should even have indignantly repudiated them, would not have been surprising. We did not ourselves think that we were justified by the evidence at our disposal in vouching for their accuracy, and the reason why we did not furnish the Congo Government with the earlier Reports was that they contained even less information upon which we could implicitly rely.

We put them forward tentatively for what they were worth in the belief that the Congo Government would recognise that, from the standpoint of its own interests, let alone any question of humanity, they constituted a strong, an overwhelming case for searching and impartial inquiry. In that hope we were disappointed. The Congo Government, not content with denying the truth of these allegations or the existence of a case for inquiry, went out of its way to impute motives to those who brought them forward. They alluded to the fact that these accusations only dated from 1895, and they built upon that fact the deduction that the whole of this agitation in England was merely a campaign of calumny motived by feelings of commercial jealousy at the growing trade and prosperity of the Congo State. I regret that the same suspicion of ulterior motives has found an echo in the writings of eminent statesmen and publicists abroad. I refer more especially to an article written, I think, by M. Etienne, in a review some time ago, in which he fastened on a statement alleged to have been made by the right hon. Member for the Forest of Dean, to the effect that he and those who acted with him would gladly see the rule of France substituted for that of Belgium in the Congo State. M. Etienne observed that expressions of that kind were calculated to increase rather than to diminish the suspicion of interested motives on our part. It is no business of mine to defend or to explain the expressions used by the right hon. Baronet; he is far better able to do that himself; but to any one who has the slightest acquaintance with English politics, and knows them, as perhaps only an Englishman can know them, from the inside, the idea that we were actuated in this matter by any selfish or personal motive is simply ridiculous. We entertain no illusions on this subject. We are quite aware that these philanthropic crusades do not contribute to our popularity abroad; we know very well, and we are constantly informed of the fact by the foreign Press, that they are commonly ascribed to motives of hypocrisy, if to nothing worse; and we act, if we act at all, simply from the conviction that an international convention binding its signatories to act on certain definite and recognised principles implies a collective as well as an individual responsibility to see that those obligations are carried out.

Not only is it absurd to suppose that commercial jealousy alone would have inspired the unanimous feeling which has been manifested on this subject in the country, but the charge of interested motives is about the most double-edged argument that the Congo Government could have possibly selected to employ in its own defence. It is true that this country has not enjoyed the proportionate share in the growth of the trade of the Congo State which it might reasonably have expected. The figures are rather significant. Between 1898 and 1901 the Belgian share of the total trade has risen in the case of imports from 67 to 72 and in the case of exports from 79 to 91 per cent. Other States, however, have grown in prosperity and wealth with even greater rapidity than the Congo State without exciting feelings of commercial jealousy in this country. Where such feelings have been excited, it has invariably been due to the fact that our commerce has been artificially excluded by tariff barriers. If that is not the case in the Congo State the alleged motive of commercial jealousy remains unexplained; whereas if it is the case, the Congo Government admit the contention we have always put forward, viz., that, whether in the spirit or in the letter, they have violated the free-trade provisions of the Berlin Act. But the Congo Government has itself supplied the most conclusive refutation of this charge. In an historical account in the *Bulletin Officiel* published some time ago, the following sentence occurs—

> "The regions reserved for State exploitations were fixed in 1892. Apart from these lands more than a quarter of the State lands, not counting those below Stanley Pool, were assigned to private persons, who in these zones had the exclusive right of collecting rubber. But only after 1897 did factories spring up on the Kassai, the Thelemba, the Lulonga, and Congo banks, and these were all Belgian. Some firms (as for instance the A.B.I.R. Company, which was originally English) voluntarily abandoned the rights they possessed."

That is to say, the Congo Government admits that the British firms who are supposed to have inspired these feelings of jealousy, voluntarily abandoned the vantage ground they actually possessed, and that the Belgian firms whose conduct has been the principal subject of complaint never established themselves at all until 1897. So far from being a refutation of the truth of these accusations, I think that the coincidence of dates affords the most remarkable corroboration. Why was it that in 1895 the Congo State first rejoiced in this sudden sunshine of prosperity, that for the first time the revenue balanced the expenditure without the aid of external subventions, and that as the Congo Government itself says 5,000 tons of rubber are now offered for sale where thirty tons were collected in 1887? The Congo Government again supply the explanation. They say that the collection of rubber, the plantations of coffee, cocoa, and tobacco, etc., date from the day when the State assumed the initiative in the matter, and that the exports were insignficant before the impulse imparted by Government enterprise.

Let me recall to the Committee the specific allegation which we made in our Note to the Powers. We said—

> "The information which has reached His Majesty's Government tends to show that, notwithstanding the obligations embodied in Article 6 of the Berlin Act, no attempt at any administration of the natives is made, that the officers of the Government do not appear to concern themselves with such work, but devote all their energy to the collection of rubber."

Mr. Casement's Report has been quoted at length, and hon. Members have referred to cases of atrocities reported by missionaries and traders; but I do not think that it is necessary to go into the evidence of Mr. Casement or others in in order to substantiate the specific allegations which we made. We have only to look at the actual findings of the Courts in the Congo State itself. If the House will allow me, I will read from the judgment of the Court of Appeal at Boma in July, 1901. They were trying cases of oppression in the Mongala district and specifying the extenuating circumstances which might be taken into account in favour of the accused. They say—

> "It is just to take into account that by the correspondence produced in the case, the chiefs of the Concession Society have, if not by formal orders, at least by their example and tolerance, induced their agents to take no account whatever of the rights, property, and lives of the natives, to use the arms and the soldiers, which should have served for their defence and the maintenance of order, to force the natives to furnish them with produce and to work for the Society, as also to pursue as rebels and outlaws those who sought to escape from the requisitions imposed upon them. That, above all, the fact that the arrest of women, and their detention to compel the villagers to furnish both produce and workmen, was tolerated and admitted even by certain of the administrative authorities of the region."

That was the finding in 1901. If that is too early we can come down to 1903, to the circular of the Governor-General of the Congo quoted in Mr. Casement's Report. That circular enjoins the commandants and officers of the "*Force Publique*" to—

> "rigorously observe the repeated instructions against the employment of black troops unaccompanied by a European officer,"

and admits that—

> "in spite of the most imperative orders forbidding the employment of black soldiers by themselves on the public service, in many places this deplorable custom continues to be practised."

Lastly we have in this very year the case of the British subject, Silvanus Jones, who was put on his trial for the commission of murders, including the murder of women and children. He did not deny, I think, that he had committed these crimes, but he pleaded as an extenuating circumstance, which the Court admitted, that he had committed them either in deference to the orders of his superiors, or in the belief that that conduct would have their sanction and approval. Is it possible, in view of the verdicts of the Congo Court itself, let alone any private testimony which may be received from other sources, that a refusal on the part of the Congo Government to institute any inquiry into the circumstances can carry any other conviction to impartial or independent minds than that either the Congo Government is afraid of the revelations to which an honest inquiry might give rise, or else that, however anxious and eager they may be severely to punish atrocities which are brought to their notice, they will take no effective steps to reform a system which makes the continuance of such atrocities possible for fear that effective reform may entail a possible diminution of revenue? From the point of view of the British Government, the Congo

Earl Percy.

reply to our Note is absolutely irrelevant. The gist of the defence put forward by the Congo Government is that the charges are always of the same character, that they have often been made before—which is unfortunately true but not our fault—that they have very often been refuted and that the refutations have always been ignored. They say that the principle of compulsory labour as an alternative to taxation is universally recognised in all civilised European countries which own possessions in Africa, and they take considerable credit to themselves for the measure which they have adopted to suppress the slave trade, to reform the *Force Publique*, and to provide schools and hospitals and such like for the natives. I do not know that if we admit every one of these contentions that they in any degree detract from the force of the case which we put forward. No one, as far as I know, certainly not His Majesty's Government, has ever denied that the Congo Government has done a great deal of good work in the Congo Basin. We have never asserted that the provisions of the Berlin Act have been universally or deliberately violated. We fully recognise that in every State the Government of the country has the right to take, either in money or in kind, a reasonable contribution from the natives for the expenses of administration. I do not think that we need be surprised that in an area comprising hundreds of thousands of squares miles and millions of natives, isolated cases of abuse of authority should occur. We draw a sharp distinction between occasional acts of cruelty by individuals, and barbarities which are in fact inseparable from the system. Our complaint is not that white men in the midst of a black population occasionally commit abominable atrocities but that they are enabled to commit them, and in most cases with perfect impunity, by the fact that the Government itself invests them with irresponsible authority, that it exercises no adequate supervision over them, and that in many cases there is no readily accessible tribunal before which they can be brought.

We are prepared to give the Congo Government every credit for good intentions and we admit that the regulations that they have laid down for the protection of the natives would, in most cases, if they were seriously enforced, probably be adequate for the protection of these natives. But while we make that admission it must be remembered that we have a striking example of what really becomes of the safeguards for the protection of the natives in the case of the Commission instituted for the express purpose of protecting them. The right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean alluded to this Commission at the beginning of the debate, and expressed regret that Sir Constantine Phipps should have said in his despatch that if that Commission had proved a failure the blame did not lie upon the central Government, or words to that effect. No doubt at that time we were not in possession of the full facts in regards to the history of the Commission, and Sir Constantine Phipps reported the conclusion he had arrived at upon the *data* then at his disposal. Subsequent investigations have shown that the Committee for the protection of natives was instituted in September, 1896. During the whole period between September, 1896, and September, 1898, of the six members composing that Commission only three met on two occasions for half a day. The Committee was reconstituted in March, 1901, but the secretary did not arrive until nine months after his appointment, the Committee was never invested with any powers which enabled them to make effective inquiries or to take evidence, and they lived at such long distances from each other that it was almost impossible for the members to come together. In the second period between 1901 and 1903 the Committee never met at all. We may make every allowance for the Congo Government, and for ignorance of what goes on at a great distance from the seat of administration, but I do not think we can possibly acquit them of a grave responsibility for the indefinite continuance of a system under which the mere exploitation of commercial resources and the accumulation of rubber is made by their own agents the excuse for insensate and inhuman barbarities.

What, in view of these facts, is the policy which His Majesty's Government intend to pursue? A great many suggestions have been put before us. Some were thrown out in the debate last year and new ones have been put forward this afternoon. I observe that of the suggestions made last year, only one has been revived this afternoon. The suggestion made by the hon. Member for Cleveland last year, and which has been repeated by the noble Lord who immediately preceded me, is that we should entrust the investigation of this question to the International Commission for the Navigation of the Congo, which was intended not only to deal with navigation but to investigate all breaches of the provisions of the Berlin Act. Another proposal was that we should seize the opportunity when the Congo Government desired to raise its import duties to refuse our assent to any increase above the limit fixed by the Act. I think I may say at once that neither of these suggestions is practicable. The first is impossible on two grounds. In the first place the International Navigation Commission has never had any existence, and can only be called into existence on the initiative and by the consent of five of the signatory Powers; and, in the second place, even if it existed at the present moment, under the wording of the Act its activities would be restricted to those parts of the Congo Basin where no Power exercised any Sovereignty, and therefore it would not meet the difficulty in this particular case. The second suggestion with regard to Customs duties is impossible because the provisions of the Berlin Act have been set aside and superseded by the subsequent Act passed at the Brussels Congress, in which it was laid down that any of the signatory Powers might raise their import duties to 10 per cent. in default of any subsequent agreement. The only practicable suggestion which I think has been made this afternoon is that this country should revive its claim to the exercise of extra-territorial jurisdiction in the Congo State. It would be a novel and inconvenient course if the representative of the Foreign Office in this House were expected not merely to defend and explain the policy adopted by the Government, but also to discuss *en clair*, and express approval or rejection of every possible expedient by which that policy might be carried out. Of course I do not dismiss a suggestion of this kind, but I will only make one or two observations in regard to it. There is no doubt whatever that we have an explicit treaty right to claim extra-territorial jurisdiction if we choose in the Congo State, but I cannot help thinking that we ought to be very careful how we mix up two questions which have really nothing to do with one another. If British subjects in any part of the world, whether in the Congo Basin or elsewhere, are unable to secure legal protection, then it is the bounden duty of the Government at home to see that protection is secured to them, whether by the assertion of extra-territorial jurisdiction or by any other method. But that has little to do with the general question of maladministration and the atrocities committed not upon British subjects, but upon subjects of the Congo State itself who would derive no benefit whatever from the exercise of extra-territorial jurisdiction by this country, while, of course, all cases in which Congo subjects were defendants and British subjects prosecutors would be tried not in British, but in Congo Courts. No doubt in certain cases His Majesty's Government have had to complain of delays and of what we conceive to be failures of justice in matters affecting British subjects. The most recent instance has been that of Silvanus Jones, to which I have already alluded. The House will remember that Jones advanced as an excuse for the murders he had committed that he had acted under the authority, or at any rate with the approval, of his superiors. I think it will occur to the minds of most Members that there would be a certain lack of humour in the selection by His Majesty's Government as the occasion for demanding extra-territorial jurisdiction the condemnation of a British subject by the Congo Courts for atrocities of the very kind which we are complaining that the Congo Government takes no effective steps to prevent.

In stating the view of His Majesty's Government in regard to the position of affairs in the Congo, I think I must invite the attention of the Committee to two paramount considerations. In the first place, we have never claimed, nor do we claim now, any special responsibility, or any special right of intervention in the affairs of the Congo State. It was because we were anxious that any representations that were addressed to the Congo Government should be, as far as possible, invested with an international character that we made our appeal, in the first instance, to the various Powers who signed the Treaty of Berlin. We have refrained from pressing these Powers for a reply to our circular, because we understood that some of them, at all events, were conducting independent local inquiries of their own, but I am bound to tell the House that, so far as we can judge, most of those Powers are not prepared to act with us in the matter. I may mention, by the way, in answer to questions asked by several hon. Members, that although the United States was not one of the signatories of the Berlin Act, in consideration of the active part which that country played in connection with the inception of the Congo State, we did communicate to them Mr. Casement's despatch as well as to the other Powers. Italy, the United States, and Turkey have informed us that they are giving our representations their most earnest consideration. But most of the Governments I am afraid take the view, which to us is quite incomprehensible, that their material interests are not sufficient in the Congo Basin to warrant any active participation in the matter. The second consideration, which I ask the Committee to bear in mind, is that the situation has been somewhat altered by the character of the last Note addressed to us by the Congo Government. I think some complaint was made of the tone of one of the later despatches we had addressed to them. I do not agree with the right hon. Baronet that the alteration in the tone of our despatches was not justified by the alteration, the very satisfactory alteration, in the tone of the last reply of the Congo Government which shows a far juster appreciation of the motives which have actuated His Majesty's Government. In that reply the Congo Government did not recur to the imputation of selfish or interested motives, and although, of course, they did not admit the truth of the allegations made in Mr. Casement's Report, they did not reject them *in toto*, but, on the contrary, recognised that they formed a strong case for inquiry, and intimated their intention to promote an investigation of that kind.

I think perhaps the House may be interested to hear the measures taken in this connection by the Congo Government which have up to the present been brought under our notice. They are at all events a satisfactory indication that the action of this House and the representations which have been made by His Majesty's Government have not been without their effect. They include the issuing of orders to the local administration at Boma to make a detailed inquiry into the system of forced contributions, and the conduct of the *gardes forestières*, the appointment of Italian officers as State inspectors, and the creation of a new office of Royal High Commissioner of the Congo who has been instructed to ensure the complete execution of the measures which have been taken for the protection of the natives. Instructions have also been issued to the A.B.I.R. Company forbidding restrictions on the freedom of commerce, and, lastly, that company has itself sent out an officer armed with independent powers to inquire into its administration, and to insist upon the removal of any officials whom he thinks ought to be removed. I do not pretend that those measures are all, or anything like all, which we have a right to expect. The reply of the Congo Government leaves absolutely out of account the question of our trade rights and the trade rights of Europe in the Congo Basin. His Majesty's Government in their original Note to the Congo Government, while asking that the question of the system of Administration should be submitted to an international conference composed of representatives of the Powers who signed the Treaty of Berlin, asked also that the question of trade rights should be referred to the Hague Tribunal. The Congo Government have made no approach at all towards meeting our views as to the latter question. But the Committee will remember that this question of the compatibility of the concession system with the free-trade provisions of the Berlin Act has arisen not only in the Congo State, but in the French Congo and in other parts of the conventional basin of the Congo.

In fact, I may say at once that we ourselves have found very considerable difficulty in drawing up the form of our concessions in the East African Protectorate with strict fidelity to the phraseology of the Berlin Act. We are perfectly willing, if we can obtain the concurrence of the other Powers, to submit to the Hague Tribunal our own practice with regard to these concessions in British territory, and we are at present in friendly communication with the French Government, with a view not only to the settlement of the private claims between British firms and French firms, but also with a view to obtaining a satisfactory interpretation of the meaning of the free-trade clauses of the Berlin Act. I hope, at all events, that if we are successful in that attempt, it will have the effect of removing the wholly unwarrantable suspicions with which the Congo Government has hitherto viewed the appeal which we have made to them.

Another consideration which renders it impossible for us to pronounce as wholly satisfactory the steps which that Government have already announced is that we are still wholly in the dark as to the character and scope of the proposed investigation and as to the composition of the tribunal by which it is to be carried out. It is obvious that an inquiry confined to the specific cases mentioned in Mr. Casement's Report, and conducted, as in the Epondo case, by the agents of the Administration or of the companies whose action has been the subject of criticism would command no general confidence, nor would its conclusions carry weight with any independent mind. We have drawn the attention of the Congo Government to these considerations in connection with their request to be supplied with the names of natives who gave information to Mr. Casement. Those names we on reflection decided to suppress for reasons which are fully explained in the White Paper, and will, I think, commend themselves to the judgment of the House. We are willing to give every information in our possession to the Congo Government provided we have adequate security that measures will be taken to prevent the exercise of any pressure to withhold evidence in the future and the possibility of retaliation on the witnesses for the evidence they have given in the past, and provided the composition of the tribunal is such as to deserve our confidence. We hope that the Congo Government will meet our views in that respect. We adhere to our original view that the more complete the international character that is given to this tribunal, and the more absolutely it is divorced from the local administration, the better it will be for the reputation of the Congo Government, and the more quickly will they secure the removal of a regrettable source of misunderstanding between two friendly Governments. But that is a matter which we must leave to their discretion. They met our appeal to an international conference by a denial of the competence of such a tribunal. Sir, we made that appeal in good faith, in no spirit of animosity to the Congo Government, and in the belief that that Government would welcome a tribunal before which they would appear, not merely as defendants or witnesses, but as joint assessors with the other Powers. The Berlin Act provides no machinery for enforcing the obligations registered therein, and though there is some force in the point of view urged by various speakers, notably by the right hon. Member for the Forest of Dean, it is at any rate technically true that it is not from the Berlin Act that the Sovereignty of the Congo State is derived. When the United States first, and the European Governments subsequently, recognised the existence in the Congo Basin of a Government possessed of a national *status*, that recognition was accorded not to the Congo State, but to an association professing an international character, and proclaiming before the world as the object of its being, not the accumulation of rubber at an infinite cost of human life and suffering, but the protection and civilisation of the natives of Africa. The international character of that association has long ago departed, but I suppose that the lofty professions and the great responsibilities remain. For good or evil the Congo State stands to-day in the eyes of millions of the heathen throughout the darkest regions of that unhappy continent as the mandatory of Europe, the sole exemplar and interpreter of Christian methods of government. What is at issue if that position is abused and that trust betrayed is not the question of the existence or the Sovereignty of a State—that is a matter on which the Congo Government may make its mind easy—but the fair fame of Western civilisation, and the reputation of the creed upon whose principles that civilisation is avowedly based. It is with that conviction that we made our appeal, not less to the Governments of Europe than to the rulers of the Congo State itself, and it is in that spirit that we earnestly hope the Congo Government will now address itself to the inquiry which it has publicly and solemnly announced.

SIR **EDWARD GREY** (Northumberland, Berwick) said he had listened with too much satisfaction both to the tone and substance of the noble Lord's speech to wish to add much to it, and if he followed him it was only for the sake of emphasising his agreement with the general view which he, and every one, had taken on this question. It was not often that there was such unanimity in the House of Commons, but it had been a somewhat gruesome unanimity; one wished that it could have been disturbed by some one who could have qualified or contradicted. But the facts were too well established. It was quite true that the noble Lord did put in some qualifying remarks on behalf of the Congo Government as to their having done good work in some respects; it was also true that Sir Harry Johnston and Major Gibbons, and some others, who had travelled, he thought, mostly on the frontier of the Congo State, had reported favourably of what they had seen in the particular districts they had been in, and had borne testimony to the fact that they had known Belgian officers who had done their best for the Africans under their care. But to say that the practices they had heard about that afternoon were not universal in the Congo State was neither here nor there, what was detestable was that they should exist at all. The story they had listened to, told by men who had gone closely into the question and who had disregarded all that seemed to them doubtful and had selected only what seemed to them clearly established, was one that would have been distressing to read about if it had related to the history of centuries ago; it was intolerable to hear about it in relation to contemporary history. As the noble Lord had said, the European Powers had a responsibility and the European good name was in question. He did not think any of the great European Powers, with the facts so clearly established as they now were, ought to be content, in view of their own honour in the matter, to sit still and do nothing. The Congo State was not an independent Power in the same sense as the great European Powers, it was really the mandatory and trustee of the other European Powers. At a time, or just before the time, when the great European Powers themselves were becoming anxious to get portions of African territory, and during the time when they had been engaged, some of them, in scrambling for territory, a scramble which aroused great jealousy and suspicion, they allowed not one of themselves, not even a small State, but an individual to possess what they might call the heart of tropical Africa. And why? Because it was a possession established in the interests of philanthropy and free trade. Well, it had led to the story they had heard. The State was really created by a sort of self-denying ordinance on the part of the various great Powers: but he would put it higher than that; he believed that many of them sanctioned it by a really generous impulse, to see civilisation spread. That that should have led to the state of things which they had heard recounted ought to be intolerable to the Powers which sanctioned it.

The noble Lord had said measures were being taken by the Congo State to improve the state of things. Well, they had heard of something like those measures before, and of course what they wanted was results and not promises. It would be satisfactory, or at least more satisfactory, if the Congo Government would definitely instruct their officials, not only to take these measures generally, but to take them specifically, even at the sacrifice of revenue. As long as the officials were called to account when there was any falling off in the revenue collected, a general instruction as to good intentions would remain a dead letter. He agreed that the Government should take whatever steps were possible; he agreed in the steps that had been taken, but they looked to them to take further steps which were possible. What further steps were possible? He thought the noble Lord was entirely justified in declining to be too explicit as to what further steps might be possible. We wanted to take as few steps as might be necessary, but at the same time we wanted other Powers to take steps, and if it remained perhaps a little doubtful as to the exact steps we might be disposed to take ourselves in the matter, it might predispose other Powers to be a little more active than they had been in co-operating with us. It was true we had no intention of interfering permanently with the Government of the Congo State, but interference, as the noble Lord told them the other day, had often been forced upon them against their will.

With regard to the jealousy and suspicion with which separate action on our part might be regarded, let them be under no illusion in the matter. Now, as at all other times, we wished to avoid exciting such jealousy or suspicion, but they knew that there was a proverb abroad about Englishmen, as Lord Salisbury once told the House of Lords—"First missionaries, then Consuls, then gunboats." Missionaries were in the Congo State; it had been suggested that we should appoint more Consuls there, and there were people who would say that these were only preliminary steps to gunboats following. These things would be said, and we must run the risk of exciting jealousy and suspicion; indeed, he expected we had excited some already by the steps that had been taken. But a matter of that kind cut both ways; it was true it made it difficult to take separate steps, but, on the other hand, whatever step we had to take was likely to lead the other Powers to take steps also. He gathered that some of the Powers whose co-operation would be most essential in this matter had declined to co-operate because they said they had no material interests. He was glad that in that debate whatever material interests we might have had been entirely subordinated to other motives. There were trade questions involved. They had heard with great satisfaction from the noble Lord that certain discussions with France were proceeding in a friendly way with regard to trade concessions, which might possibly lead to the clearing up of the difficulties connected with the Berlin Act, and might be a help in getting some trade difficulties within the Congo overcome, but that had not been the motive of that debate. Nobody could think for a moment that material interests had not been entirely superseded in the minds of the Committee by humanitarian interests and a general sense of the responsibility of the civilised Powers. To the Powers which said that they had no material interests, he thought they must say that we also had no material interests sufficient to justify separate action on our part, but that as it was so obvious that very little combined pressure from the European Powers would effect what was wanted, and as the honour and good name of the Powers who consented to the creation of this State was involved, they, like us, must see that there was a little more than the question of material interests involved.

The first change, he thought, which was wanted with regard to the Congo State, whenever there was an opportunity of bringing it about, was that the Government of that State should be one which was responsible to a Parliament. He did not care what European Parliament, so long as it was a European Parliament. If that Government had been responsible to a Belgian or other Parliament these things would have been put a stop to long ago. Whatever happened, let them never again be a party to setting up in any part of the world a private irresponsible Government of this kind. He hoped that the other Powers would join with us on the first opportunity in saying that this Government should be responsible to some representative assembly. With regard to our appointing Consuls, he was very glad that the noble Lord did not dismiss that suggestion.

Earl PERCY said he was speaking of Consular jurisdiction.

Sir EDWARD GREY said he meant Consuls with Consular jurisdiction. The right hon. Member for Cambridge University had said that we could only do that, practically, by dealing with a barbarous Government. He thought we might put the establishment of Consuls on the ground that if other Powers would not co-operate with us in this matter, in what we considered the general interests of humanity and civilisation, which were as much theirs as ours, we must at any rate see to the protection of our own subjects. It was true, as the noble Lord said, that there was not a favourable opportunity at the present moment; but when we had a case like the Stokes case on record, a case in which a man was clearly illegally executed, we had a case which could not have happened under Consular jurisdiction of our own, and which would have been ample justification for our taking steps to establish a Consular jurisdiction. It was true that the susceptibilities of other Powers might be aroused if we appointed Consuls. Then by all means let them appoint Consuls of their own. He would point out to the noble Lord that his hon. friend the Member for Oldham, in pressing this step on the Government, put it exceedingly moderately and suggested that it should not be taken without first entering into communication with other European Powers. By all means let that be done, and if other European Powers did not like our taking such steps let them suggest other steps. He would like to see some conference called to revise the Berlin Act. The Berlin Act, under which this State was created, and which had other conditions, was now getting rather old, and these international Acts when they got old began to lose their force, just in the same way, he believed, as an accumulator charged with electricity lost a great deal of its force and ceased to be of any use if it were left for some time. The results of these European conferences tended after a time to lose their force. Sometimes it was a happy thing that they did so tend, but here there was occasion why they should remain in force, and he thought the time had come when the Powers might usefully consider the question of coming again into conference and considering how far the Berlin Act needed revision. He trusted that the Government would be on the look-out for any favourable opportunities which might arise in European politics for pressing this question. There was an ebb and flow, and there were currents and eddies in European politics which sometimes provided unexpected opportunities of getting the Powers to work together in a matter of this kind. He was convinced of this, and he was sure that the noble Lord would feel, from the tone of the debate that afternoon, from the fact that this was a House of Commons policy, and from the way in which his own speech had been received by the whole House, that the country would be only too ready to support the Government in any steps they might feel justified in taking.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis) said he had waited until the conclusion of the debate on the Congo State to introduce another subject, which would not occupy the attention of the Committee at any great length. He referred to the action of the Foreign Office under the Brussels Sugar Convention. He would not enter into the merits of that Convention except to say that he believed it had not produced all the marvellous results predicted for it; it had not brought prosperity to the West Indies, and certainly had not brought anything but dearer sugar to this country. The permanent Commission established under the Convention at Brussels was in a position to dictate to this country the whole of its tariff policy in regard to sugar; and Papers had been presented to the House giving a description of the further findings of that Commission. They were very important Papers indeed, for various reasons; and having read them he confessed to a desire, which had long existed in his mind, that some means could be found of endowing the Foreign Office with some gentleman possessed of elementary notions of business and language. The permanent Commission which had been set up under that Convention went on holding its meetings at Brussels and giving its decisions with regard to bounties and the duties which the various countries, including Great Britain, should put on, and yet the House had no adequate information in regard to its proceedings. He submitted that having regard to the importance of the decisions arrived at by that Convention and the binding nature of those decisions on this country, it was absolutely necessary that the proceedings of that Commission, as represented by the *procès-verbaux*, should be laid on the Table of the House, inasmuch as they comprised part of the duty this House had to perform, and the House ought to know the decisions their masters had taken, and what steps it was necessary for the Government to take. It was true that there were copies of some of them in the library, but those copies were incomplete and did not contain the most important report, namely, that of the twenty-third sitting. He pointed out that the despatch of Sir Henry Bergne on the decision of the Commission arrived at on 16th October, as published in the White Paper, contained a most serious error. The delegates actually arrived at the decision that the Russian system gave rise to a bounty, but according to the White Paper Sir Henry Bergne stated that the Commission affirmed that the Russian system did not give rise to a bounty. By the courtesy of the noble Lord he had been able to ascertain that the word "not" was a mistake, But what a mistake to make. A mistake which represented to us the exact contrary of the decision at which the Commission arrived. How it could have been allowed to pass by those who read the proofs of the Foreign Office Papers or by Sir Henry Bergne himself, who presumably read the proof, he could not conceive, but it was a most serious thing. The House would remember that in the original translation of the Convention there were so many errors that the Government had to withdraw the Paper, but this blunder was of capital importance, and so extraordinary a blunder raised great doubts in his mind as to the accuracy of the other Papers.

There was, again, the important point of the treatment of the sugars of our self-governing Colonies. The Commission came to the conclusion that bounties on sugar were given by three groups of British Colonies—Canada, South Africa, and the Australian Commonwealth. They fixed the countervailing duties on those sugars at 3f. 63c. per hundred kilos of refined sugar in the case of Canada, 3f. 89c. in the case of South Africa, and 5f. 62c. in the case of the Australian Commonwealth. That, he imagined, in the last case would amount to about 2s. 6d. per cwt. The effect of that decision with regard to those colonies was that every one of those countries which had contracted with us for the presumed advantage of our West Indian Colonies, and with whom in return we had contracted to exclude sugar which was bounty-fed and so prevent our people having cheap sugar—every one of the contracting parties to the Sugar Convention was obliged to place these countervailing duties on their sugar. They would put duties on all Canadian, South African, and Australian sugar that they received, and this Government, which had taken up the defence of the self-governing Colonies against the wicked foreigner, would be obliged to submit. It was true that this country would not impose such duties, because at the moment of ratifying the Convention His Majesty's Government declared that they would not carry out the undoubted obligation of the Convention by imposing countervailing duties on sugar from the self-governing Colonies. It was also true that this country was the greatest consumer of colonial sugar, so that the imposition of the duty by the other contracting States was not so important as it would otherwise be. Still, it was important, because the exportation of sugar from the Colonies to the other contracting States might become larger, but whatever dimensions it assumed, so long as this Convention lasted, every pound of that sugar would be subject to this differential tax. Of the twenty-third sitting of the Commission the House had no account.

They had not the *procès-verbal*, in the French, and consequently had to rely on Sir Henry Bergne's account. That account, however, did not give the date of the sitting—dates and time were nothing to the Foreign Office—but he thought he might fairly assume that it was in October last. At that sitting Sir Henry Bergne raised the serious question of sugared products. Personally, he believed that the Convention and all its principles applied to both sugar and sugared products, and it was only right that if it applied to one it should to the other. Sir Henry Bergne stated—

> "In the course of Thursday's sitting I had the honour to put the following question to the Commission whether according to Article I. of the Convention the contracting States have power to

levy a surtax on sugared products sufficiently high to give rise to a bounty."

The matter was discussed, and it was quite clear that the whole tendency was that while we were still bound to exclude from our ports any sugar in its crude state which had received a bounty, however cheap it might become, or however advantageous to our people, any other country was to be allowed to send sugared products, and we had no remedy. This Commission was now engaged in the work of interpreting the treaty, a work for which it was not suited, and for which it was never intended. The whole of the important questions which had been discussed turned upon the interpretation of the treaty. They came to the conclusion in October last that they were not quite ready to interpret this treaty. There was no doubt to his mind as to its meaning, for it applied to sugar in its raw state as well as to sugared products, and all the penalties and obligations applied to both. The object of this country was that sugar should be cheap, but their object was dear sugar and the retention of the monopoly. When this serious question was submitted to the Commission they said they could not decide upon it. First of all, let him say that there was a vote taken, but it appeared that the affirmation made by the Commission that the contracting States had the right to levy on sugared products a surtax higher than Article III. allowed was come to by the vote of eight in the affirmative, and one in the negative, that one being Great Britain. The very result had happened which the opponents of the Convention had always predicted, namely, that the voice of this country, the great sugar-consuming country, the country upon which these sugar-producing countries lived, which ought to be the dominating voice, was overruled by the countries interested in dear sugar. The question of how this was to be dealt with was left open. According to Sir Henry Bergne the delegates had received instructions of such a nature as left no hope of obtaining a satisfactory solution of the matter that session, and Sir Henry urged the Commission to fix the next meeting at a not very distant date. Could the noble Lord tell him the date of the twenty-third sitting?

EARL PERCY: I think it was in March.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES said the noble Lord appeared to know no more than he did as to the sittings. The question of the time was very important. The next meeting was fixed for October and that was a very long time. That was seven months, but his impression was that it was twelve months from the last meeting. He wanted to draw the attention of the Committee to these declarations. Sir Henry Bergne said—

"If, however, my Government assents to an adjournment it must be well understood that they reserve full liberty to take in the interval any measures which seem to them necessary to protect British trade in sugared products against the competition of bounty-fed products."

On page 30 at the bottom Sir Henry Bergne had pointed out that the only remedy for any misdeed was the absolute exclusion of the sugar. He wished to ask the noble Lord—What has the Government done, what are they doing, or what do they propose to do to carry out Sir Henry Bergne's declaration between the twenty-third sitting of the Conference and October next? Sir Henry Bergne's declaration referred not to a sitting in October, but to what would happen in the meantime. Did the Government propose to take any steps, or did they mean to wait till the month of October, leaving British trade in the meantime subject to what would be unfair competition prohibited by the Convention? The whole Sugar Convention had been the most unfortunate and blundering business ever entered into by this country. The same blundering seemed to be committed in every act done, and in every document issued. He thought the noble Lord would be shocked at the amazing and unprecedented blunder committed in this Paper. He, himself, had considerable difficulty in accepting it as at all accurate, and he should like to see the *procès-verbaux*.

MR. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland) said he regretted that owing to the answer he received that afternoon from the noble Lord in regard to the alienation of territory in East Africa he could not indulge in the universal congratulations which had been showered upon his conduct. He had for some time tried his best to get information from the noble Lord with regard to the concessions to which for the first time he had vaguely alluded that afternoon. The noble Lord had made some suggestion as to submitting these concessions to the Conference at the Hague. He thought the Members of the House of Commons were also fairly entitled to have these concessions submitted to them. Why should they not be submitted here? If he could find them for himself he would not trouble the noble Lord about them. There was a great deal of mystery about them. What were the concessions which he was prepared to submit to the Hague Conference. When a straightforward Question was asked that afternoon the noble Lord endeavoured to evade it by what was more or less a legal quibble.

*EARL PERCY: I spoke of concessions. The hon. Member asked about what he calls the "alienation of territory." It is quite a different thing.

MR. CATHCART WASON said it was the same thing as alienation. It was parting with property which was in possession of this country to some persons. The House of Commons was entitled to know who were the persons who had got it and what consideration had been paid for it. Why should this alienation of territory be shrouded in mystery, and why should the House of Commons be absolutely refused information on the subject? What reason could there be for this secrecy?

*THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I would point out to the hon. Gentleman that the Uganda and East Africa Protectorates are under separate Votes, and that it would not be in order to discuss them on this Vote.

MR. CATHCART WASON said he was discussing the noble Lord's refusal to give information, and the taking advantage of a legal quibble because the word "alienation" instead of lease had been used. If it was out of order to do so he would not pursue the subject further at present.

*EARL PERCY: If the hon. Member wishes to know exactly which concessions we would refer to the Hague Tribunal I cannot tell him. But the conditions of the lease of land to the Jews are still under consideration and have nothing to do with the matter.

MR. CATHCART WASON said he was entitled to call attention to the noble Lord's refusal to answer a Question on the Vote for his salary.

*THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member can allude to the noble Lord's refusal to answer the Question, but he cannot go into the Vote to which the Question refers.

MR. CATHCART WASON said he did not propose to do so. The Question which the noble Lord refused to answer was not asked in any unfriendly spirit to the Foreign Office, and the noble Lord took a line in regard to the Question which he had never known to be taken in the House before. The information asked would, he believed, be of great interest to the House. It referred to a definite matter in which the whole country was immensely interested. Surely there was nothing whatever to be ashamed of in the noble Lord's action in connection with the matter.

And, it being half-past Seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL (TRAMWAYS AND IMPROVEMENTS) BILL (BY ORDER).

As amended, considered.

Clause (For preventing obstruction at Westminster Bridge).

"Whereas it has been arranged between the Council and the Commissioner of Police that on and after the first day of January, nineteen hundred and five, the Council shall not run any car on that portion of the tramway in Westminster Bridge Road which lies to the west of its junction with York Road on such days and at such hours as the Commissioner of Police may from time to time direct. Such arrangement is hereby confirmed.

"Provided always, that if any question shall arise between the Council and the Commissioner as to whether any such direction is reasonable, such question shall be determined by the Secretary of State for the Home Department."—(*Mr. Cochrane.*)

Brought up, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be now read a second time."

DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.) said he gathered from the new clause that something in the nature of an agreement had been arrived at between the London County Council and the Commissioner of Police. He had great respect for the judgment of the London County Council in these matters and greater respect for his hon. friend the Member for Battersea, who was the faithful historian of the poor of London for all time. At the same time he was sorry to see the London County Council tacitly agreeing to this new clause. Of course there was congestion at Westminster Bridge, but that was because the Government would not allow the tramway to be run across the bridge. Colonel Yorke, the railway inspector of the Board of Trade, had stated that the real remedy to remove the congestion was to allow the trams to be run over the bridge. This proposal was to remove the terminus 250 yards further south. He greatly regretted that that decision had been come to. It would constitute a great hardship to the working people of South London. They would have to walk this distance in order to make their connection with the traffic going east and west by St. Thomas's Hospital, and that was bad enough, but when they came to go home it would be far worse. People going home found it impossible to get a seat at the terminus, and they walked down very often as far as the South-Western Railway Bridge and got into a tram there which was coming up to the terminus, and paid an extra halfpenny for the privilege of riding home, and if this line was thrown back to the middle of York Road, these poor people would have to walk nearly to Christ Church before they could obtain a seat. He could not, however much he regretted the decision which had been arrived at, divide the House against this clause, because the hon. Member for Battersea was a very shrewd man in all these matters, and of course it was quite possible that he had obtained a *quid pro quo* for this arrangement. He contended, however, that the difficulty would be accentuated by sending back all these trams to the middle of York Road. He would not labour the matter, but he would just ask the representative of the Home Office two questions. The new clause said the trams should stop at York Road "on such days and at such hours as the Commissioner of Police may from time to time appoint." Would it be contended for the police that for the whole of certain days no trams should come past York Road? He hoped no such interpretation would be put upon it. The second question was, would the halfpenny buses, which now were the property of private owners, and ran from St. Thomas's Hospital over the bridge and so linked up the tram system, be compelled to start from York Road, because if that could be done the difficulty might be mitigated a little.

CAPTAIN JESSEL (St. Pancras, S.) said that they had always heard from the representatives of the London County Council in this House that it was essential, if this congestion was to be removed, that the trams should run over the bridge; now they heard that in spite of all those protestations the London County Council had come to an agreement with the Government which made it impossible for the tramways ever to cross Westminster Bridge. He reminded the House of the very strong evidence given by the police before the Committee upstairs as to the congestion.

DR. MACNAMARA: Hear, hear! Take the trams across the bridge.

CAPTAIN JESSEL said he did not propose to argue that question at the present time, because it had been already decided by the Instruction given to the Committee on this Bill. If any justification had been required for the course which had been taken in this matter, it was to be found in the fact that the

London County Council had agreed to this clause. But he was surprised that the hon. Member for Battersea had taken it lying down. He rather suspected there must, as the hon. Member for Camberwell had said, be some *quid pro quo*, and he could not but think, with all due deference to the London County Council, in the face of the clause before the House, that those hon. Members who had always strenuously opposed the extension of this tramway across the bridge had been amply justified in the course they had taken.

MR. JOHN BURNS (Battersea) said he declined to be drawn upon a subject which would be very properly discussed at a later stage. Sufficient for the evening was the good thereof. He had no complaint to make of the very just strictures which the hon. Member for Camberwell thought fit in a genial way to pass, but he would remind the hon. Member for St. Pancras that by *force majeure* the hon. Member for Peckham, assisted by the hon. Member for St. Pancras, put a disabling Motion upon the London County Council. They were responsible for denying to the people of South London the right of access to the bridge and over the bridge by tram. The hon. Baronet the Member for Peckham was a full-blown reactionary, and was proud of his reaction, but he, Mr. Burns, had such confidence in the courage of the hon. Baronet that he knew when he took a right course he would face his critics with the courage he always displayed when doing the wrong thing. This course had been put on the London County Council by the House of Commons. The London County Council had had to defer to the House of Commons in this matter. Then the Home Office, which was responsible for the police and the regulation of street traffic, came along and suggested that in consequence of the congestion on the south side of Westminster Bridge, which could not be removed except by bringing the trams over the bridge, and turning them down the Embankment, they must do something. The police already had power to make the London County Council do this, without this clause. The London County Council did not initiate this clause; the Home Office asked for it and the London County Council had to defer, showing that sweet reasonableness which they always did, and which ought to count to righteousness. He acquitted himself of all responsibility for this clause, and the only consolation he had in his misfortune was that the London County Council was not responsible for it, and only gave a reluctant consent to it. He repudiated the suggestion that the London County Council had derived any advantage elsewhere in consideration of accepting it.

***THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT** (Mr. COCHRANE, Ayrshire, N.) said at one time he did not think it necessary to say anything in regard to the clause which he had moved, but after the speech of the hon. Member for Camberwell, who took upon himself to speak on behalf of the London County Council——

DR. MACNAMARA: No, not on behalf of the London County Council.

***MR. COCHRANE**: Then I should like to know on whose behalf the hon. Member did speak.

DR. MACNAMARA: On behalf of the people of Camberwell, whom I have the honour to represent.

***MR. COCHRANE** said the hon. Member, speaking for Camberwell, had accused him of seeking some *quid pro quo* from the hon. Member for Battersea for the clause he now moved, and, that being so, he was compelled briefly to state the steps which led up to the moving of this clause. He failed to understand what the hon. Member for Battersea meant when he said that the London County Council reluctantly accepted this clause.

MR. JOHN BURNS said to prevent any misunderstanding he would explain that he meant reluctantly in the sense that the London County Council wished to get rid of the congestion by carrying the trams over the bridge and down the Embankment; that having been beaten upon that scheme, they were reluctantly compelled to consent to the suggestion of the Home Secretary only in that sense.

*Mr. COCHRANE said he thought it was not quite accurate to say that the Council reluctantly accepted the clause. The hon. Member for Camberwell appeared to accuse the Home Department of being the friends of the omnibus proprietors, and not of the public. It was because the Department were the friends of the public that they had thought it necessary to move this clause. Representations had from time to time been made as to the danger arising from the congestion of traffic at this point, and when the County Council took over the tramways system their attention was called to the matter. The Council took up a *non-possumus* attitude; they were not prepared to do anything.

Dr. MACNAMARA said that was not the case. The Council wished to take the tramway over the bridge.

*Mr. COCHRANE said the Commissioner of Police stated before the Committee that in two years there had occurred at this point in the Westminster Bridge Road 179 collisions and ninety-three accidents, of which three were fatal and six or seven were serious. The hon. Member for Battersea did not seem willing to accept it, but the London County Council very frankly and fairly recognised the true state of the case when it was pointed out to them. He had no complaint to make of the manner in which he had been met, and they entirely agreed in substance with the clause which he had now put down. They suggested some slight alteration in the wording, but that made no difference as to the stringency of the provisions, which gave authority to the police to regulate the traffic on the spot any day the Commissioner of Police might think fit. Power was given to stop omnibuses at certain parts, so as to facilitate traffic. He hoped he had made out a case for the clause. He felt that it was unnecessary for him to deal with ancient history, and he would not have detained the House so long but for the terms in which the hon. Member for Camberwell had twitted him with being squared by certain particular parties.

Question put, and agreed to.

Clause added to the Bill.

Mr. REMNANT (Finsbury, Holborn) said that the Amendment which stood on the Paper in his name referred to the extension of the Hampstead Road Tramway down half the length of Tottenham Court Road. His opposition to this extension was not to the tramway as a tramway. The district which he had the honour to represent would do their best to support any reasonable proposal for a tramway where facilities were wanted and could properly be given. But he hoped the House would agree with him that a case for this particular line had not been made out. There was a tramway terminus at the north side of Euston Road, where, on account of the narrowness of the street, there had been for a considerable number of years great congestion of traffic. The proposal now before the House was to carry the tramway across Euston Road, and practically half way down the length of Tottenham Court Road. The original proposal was to carry it the full length of Tottenham Court Road to Oxford Street, but that had been unanimously rejected by the Committee. He was not opposing the present extension in the interest of any private people, but on broad grounds of public policy. He held that tramway termini in the central districts of London were a mistake. They should be placed in the outskirts, or away as far as possible from the congested areas. Sanction had already been given for a tube railway down Tottenham Court Road, and no reason had been shown for this short extension of the tramway in a narrow street. Instead of relieving the congestion at Euston Road, it would increase it. One was led to believe that the London County Council had some ulterior motive in asking for this short line which led to nowhere, but after the Traffic Commission, which was shortly about to issue its Report, had made its recommendations the rejection of this small extension line would not prejudice any large comprehensive scheme which included the Tottenham area being adopted. There was no urgency for this short line, which could not be worked by itself. Moreover, the Chief Commissioner of Police had reported that this tramway would cause great delay at Euston Road, and render the traffic there almost unworkable. In one part of Tottenham Court Road there was not sufficient room for a double line of rails and to give the statutory nine feet six inches clear roadway from the kerb. He begged to move.

MR. BULL (Hammersmith) said he seconded the Amendment on the ground that this extension should be rejected until the report of the Traffic Commission was issued. He hoped that the Traffic Commission would give some attention to the question of tramway termini, which were practically butt ends in the middle of large thoroughfares. What they must have was some system under which the tramways would start in a side street. The London County Council should set aside a large piece of land at the side of the road where the cars should start without stopping the traffic, and where the people could wait for the cars they wanted without danger.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 7, line 17, to leave out the words in lines 17 to 24 inclusive."—(*Mr. Remnant.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

*MR. COMPTON RICKETT (Scarborough) said that the Committee upstairs, of which he was Chairman, had considered this short line quite apart from the Report of the Traffic Commission. They had interpreted the necessity for it on the principles adopted by Parliament for existing lines. The centre of London was approached from several sides. There were tramways along Gray's Inn Road, and there were tramway termini in Theobald's Road, Aldersgate, Aldgate, Whitechapel, and in Moorgate Street, and the amount of traffic in these thoroughfares was rather more than less than the traffic in Tottenham Court Road. The conditions of Tottenham Court Road were in no way such as to claim exception compared with these other lines of approach to the centre of London. Parliament had decided that London should have a tramway system as well as a tube system. People who were only going a short distance would not go to a tube station, be carried down in a lift to the tube, and then at the next station go up a lift again, when they could jump on a tramway and proceed to their destination more pleasantly. The Committee had declined to allow a double line of tramways to be carried along Tottenham Court Road beyond the point at which there was a clear width of nine feet six inches on either side of the outer rails. In the portion of the line now sanctioned there was that width, and in some places more. The Committee had also to consider the question of Euston Road. The block of traffic there was caused not only by the tramway terminus at the foot of Hampstead Road, but by the narrowness of the street proceeding westwards towards Portland Street Station. Moreover, at present the tramways were horsed, and it was always cumbersome to change the horses at the terminus, and that process tended to increase the block. When the electrification of the line took place there would not be the same blocking by the moving of the horses. It had been said, why not adopt a shallow subway as in New York—a system which allowed the tramway to get underground when the streets were crowded, and to return to the surface at spots where the traffic was less? That system was impossible in Tottenham Court Road, for the very good reason that the Metropolitan Railway passed along Euston Road, and the crown of the tunnel came within 8 feet of the surface.

The lease of the tramway company for the Hampstead line would fall in shortly, and the London County Council desired to extend the line down to Oxford Street. That the Committee declined to sanction; and the line would now stop short at Francis Street, which would relieve the congestion of traffic at Euston Road and Hampstead Road. The width of the road at Francis Street was 48 feet, which gave a margin on either side of the rails of 16 feet 8 inches. The pavement on the west side was 22 feet in width, and on the east side 18 feet, so that there was ample accommodation for the foot traffic at the terminus. There was, therefore, ample accommodation; and even if the terminus at Hampstead Road were widened, there would only be the same width of roadway. The proposed terminus at Francis Street would be far more convenient.

It was little over one-third of a mile from Oxford Street; and the trams running down Tottenham Court Road would collect a great deal of traffic. Moreover, the vast number of people employed in shops in Oxford Street would be able to avail of this service, and distribute themselves throughout the North and North-East of London. Therefore, even if the line were not to run to Oxford Street, there was a good case for having the terminus at Francis Street. Messrs. Maple and Shoolbred appeared to be afraid that their interests would be affected. He had had a great deal of experience of Tramway Bills, and he found, as a rule, the same evidence given and the same fears expressed; but the fears immediately disappeared when the line was constructed. A tramway only affected a certain class of residents. The little shops were benefited as was also property of a residential kind of a lower character. Carriages coming from the West End would only have to cross the line and put down their occupants at the shops and then wait in a side street. Further, the tram cars would take the place of omnibuses, and that would leave a greater margin for carriages.

With regard to electrification, although the London County Council would not possess themselves of the tramways until 1909, they had the right to compel the company to electrify them. Therefore, within twelve months this new line would be laid; and the whole system in North London would probably be electrified. The decision of the Committee was not unanimous; but he trusted that the House would support the majority.

CAPTAIN JESSEL said as the Member representing the Division in which the new tramway was proposed to be put down, he hoped he would be pardoned for intervening in the debate. It was not a very usual course to take in this House to ask the House to upset a Report sent from a Committee upstairs; but on this occasion the circumstances were not of a usual character. It had been frequently said that the fact that the Traffic Commission was sitting was no reason why this tramway should not be passed. Counsel for the London County Council upstairs said that it was an extraordinary thing that no Instructions to this Bill were moved in the House; but they were so confident that the Committee upstairs would reject the scheme that they did not wish to waste the time of the House by moving an Instruction. If, however, they did not object now, their action might be construed if the Bill went to another place as being favourable to it. He wished to remind the House that the scheme of the Bill was not the original scheme. The original scheme was for a tramway from Hampstead Road right down to Oxford Street. The Committee stopped the tramway half way down Tottenham Court Road, and he thought they were wise, but they were not quite wise enough. There was no doubt, as the hon. Member for Scarborough said, that it was the intention of the London County Council to connect North and South London; but it was precisely because the question of connecting North and South was such a very important one that he hoped the House would not prejudge the case by sanctioning this small extension, especially as a Royal Commission was now considering the subject.

As regarded St. Pancras, he would tell the House frankly the position. Three out of the four Divisions were in favour of the tramway. The reason was obvious—people who lived away from the tramway did not mind; but as regarded his own Division there was the most strenuous opposition to this scheme. Fifteen members in wards in his constituency were returned in opposition to the tramway; and at the last London County Council election both county councillors in his Division were returned more or less because they were not in favour of the tramway scheme. With one exception, every single local municipal representative was against the extension of the tramway. With reference to the proposed terminus at Francis Street, everyone knew that driving to Euston, St. Pancras, or King's Cross from the West the usual way was to turn down Tottenham Court Road and up Francis Street. If the terminus were at Francis Street there would be a tremendous amount of congestion there, which would cause accidents and block the traffic right in the middle of one of the most busy streets in London. He would remind the House that the London County Council would not proceed to widen Hampstead Road, which was one of the most dangerous spots in London, unless the borough council consented to the tramway being extended down Tottenham Court Road. Under the circumstances, it was only natural that the representatives of North-west and East St. Pancras should have voted for this tramway when they were going to secure a great benefit in the widening of Hampstead Road. He was very much in favour of linking up the tramway system between North and South; but he maintained, with all due deference, that this was not the best method of doing it. There were other alternatives; and he would ask the House to wait until the Traffic Commission, which was pecially appointed to consider the subject, had reported, and not allow a few yards of tramway to be laid down in Tottenham Court Road against the wishes of the inhabitants of the district.

*Mr. HUDSON (Hertfordshire, Hitchin) said he had frequently himself had to wait at the junction of Hampstead Road and Euston Road before the police would permit him to pass. There was very heavy traffic from the West End to the stations of the Central Railway, the London and North-Western, and the Midland Railways, and the greatest possible inconvenience was caused at that point. The road was very narrow, and if the London County Council would make it wider it would be a very great convenience, for general traffic.

Mr. JOHN BURNS said not for the first time the House of Commons had resolved itself into a sub-Committee of the Highways Department and discussed matters which would have been much better left to the London County Council acting with the local authorities. They had the duty imposed upon them of defending in the House of Commons proposals that were remitted by the House to a Committee, and which, after thirteen days of exhaustive consideration, were passed. After that they had resurrection pie in the House itself, to an extent which interfered with the business of Parliament and which was a discredit to every hon. Member when the broad facts of the situation were considered. He did not see why the House of Commons should waste its time in discussing the question of Hampstead Road, Tottenham Court Road, or Westminster Bridge. The proper tribunal for all such details was the Committee upstairs. The House of Commons had, however, decided to adopt this view on tramway questions and, therefore, he was compelled reluctantly to reply to one or two points put forward by various speakers who opposed the Bill. First, there was the hon. Member for Holborn who, strictly speaking, had no *locus standi* at all, because no portion of the tramway allowed by the Committee was within the jurisdiction of the borough of Holborn. The hon. Gentleman said that the difficulty which this extension would remove could be got rid of by the widening of Hampstead Road. As a matter of fact, the London County Council, by arrangement with the local authorities, were going to widen Hampstead Road at the point where the tramway now stopped. But, when that widening was carried out, at enormous expense, the road would not be any wider than at the new terminus.

*Mr. HUDSON said that there was a large lavatory in the middle of the road at Francis Street.

Mr. JOHN BURNS said that that difficulty could be easily got over by removing the entrance to the pavement. The hon. Member for Holborn asked what was gained by extending the tramway a few feet? The few feet happened to be 1,800 feet.

Mr. REMNANT said he mentioned a little distance.

Mr. JOHN BURNS said he would accept the correction; but the little distance was 600 yards along the widest part of Tottenham Court Road with a foot pavement twenty-seven feet in width, which would permit a large number of people to collect there without any inconvenience. That was the reason why they wished to remove the terminus. The hon. Member for Holborn spoke about tube railways. Whenever tramways were mentioned tube railways were always suggested as an alternative. He had only one opinion about tube railways, and he would strongly recommend investors not to put their money in them, because in ten years time he believed Mr. Yerkes and Mr. Perks would be handing their tubes over to the London County Council as relief sewers because people would not travel in them. Tube railways were no alternative. People preferred the trams. Why? Because they were cleaner, cheaper, and more rapid than the tubes and less dangerous than the omnibuses. The omnibuses were the main cause of congestion in the London streets. The hon. Member for Holborn said that the extension would lead nowhere. He could assure him that it would. It would lead into the widest portion of Tottenham Court Road and to a terminus much more suitable than the present terminus. The hon. Member tried to catch the ear of the House by saying that there was no intention to electrify the trams. There was such an intention, and it would be proceeded with as soon as engineering difficulties could be got over. He was surprised at the opposition of the hon. Member for Hammersmith, who represented a district through which the London United Tramways ran. The hon. Member said that tramway termini were practically railway stations. That was in a sense true; and the only way to get over it was by having a circular route. But pending that, the only plan was to avoid, as far as possible, putting termini at cross traffic roads. They should be put in the widest portion of the thoroughfare, where they would do the least harm. In that way the London County Council were pursuing the line of least resistance, because they did not propose to have termini at shops or cross roads. The terminus at Hampstead Road, where four roads met, was one of the worst places for such a purpose.

MR. REMNANT said he never doubted it.

MR. JOHN BURNS said that then the hon. Gentleman should agree with him. What induced the Home Office to seek powers to put the terminus at Westminster Bridge further back? It was to avoid the congestion of traffic coming from a number of converging roads. It was worse still at Hampstead Road, because the horses had to be changed, and that occupied a very considerable part of the roadway. Their proposal was to have no stopping place for 100 yards at either side of the present terminus; and then impatient Members of Parliament driving to railway stations would be able to get across without being stopped. Therefore, he contended that the hon. Member for Holborn had no case. As regarded the hon. Member for St. Pancras he did not represent his own constituency in the matter. The hon. Gentleman was elected on higher questions. He was told to think Imperially, and to vote patriotically in the House of Commons on political questions. The hon. Gentleman claimed to represent St. Pancras in the matter; but three of the four divisions in St. Pancras were in favour of the Bill. What was more, the Mayor and several aldermen stated before the Committee that St. Pancras wanted the congestion at the Hampstead Road terminus removed. The view of the House of Lords on this question of tramways was more acceptable than that of hon. Members opposite, and when the House of Lords agreed with Battersea they were unanimous. The House of Lords gave the London County Council permission to take the trams over Putney Bridge. It had only a width of twenty-two feet between the herbs, and yet the House of Commons was now asked to reject a Bill for a tramway through a road with a width of forty-eight feet and very large pavements on either side.

Messrs. Maple and Shoolbred were the only firms who objected to this scheme. He had great respect for both those firms in their proper lines, and no one regretted more than he the lamentable death of the genial Baronet the Member for Dulwich. They all admired Mr. Shoolbred's four-in-hand. He had often seen it in Hyde Park, and it was a beautiful turnout. But every Londoner could not have a four-in-hand; the substitute was the half-penny tram. What right had Mr. Shoolbred to deny his shop-girls, warehousemen, and assistants the right to ride in a tram from Highbury or Islington down the Tottenham Court Road? These people had been compelled to write letters from here, there and everywhere, against this Bill because a kindly-hearted governor asked them to do so. Shoolbred's and Maple's might supply Members of Parliament with furniture and other domestic conveniences, but they had no right to supply them with arguments or legislative directions. The omnibus owners also had opposed the Bill, and they had been exceedingly busy during the last fortnight. The House of Commons would soon have to take into consideration the extent to which'bus owners, tube railway promoters, and other interested persons frequented the precincts of Parliament. No doubt the 'bus-owners had a perfect right to take every legitimate step to maintain their present monopoly of the streets of London, but on a wet day thousands of people had to walk the whole distance of Tottenham Court Road to secure a conveyance, so full were the omnibuses, and this Bill was required to make good the deficiency of transit the omnibuses were responsible for creating. Provincial authorities had had to fight this battle over and over again, but fears had been shown to be ungrounded, and apprehensions misplaced, and he appealed to provincial Members to resist this Motion. Even if the Bill would do one or two shopkeepers harm, Parliament had no right to ignore the rights of the 300,000,000 passengers who in the course of a year would use the tramway. As the police had no objection and the Home Office did not oppose, he appealed to London Members, especially those on the other side of the House, to confer the boon of this Bill upon their constituents, and to reject the Amendment which had been moved.

Mr. ERNEST GRAY (West Ham, N.) said it was most regrettable that the hon. Member for Battersea should invariably attempt to make out that these questions necessarily involved a struggle between the rich and the poor. That was not the case at all. If any other county council in the kingdom came forward with a proposal of this kind it would be received by the House with the utmost astonishment; but Parliament had become accustomed to all sorts of grotesque proposals from the London County Council, who ought now to be told that no decisions on these matters would be come to until the Commission which was inquiring into the whole matter had reported. It was not right that the recommendations of that Commission should be prejudiced by the adoption of this tramway scheme. As a Londoner familiar with the district concerned, he submitted that the present proposal was altogether unjustifiable. For many years the County Council had enjoyed the right to call upon the company working the Northern lines to electrify those tramways, but they had made no real effort in that direction, and there was no immediate prospect of electrical traction being adopted; therefore, the Amendment, if carried, would lead to no delay. All sections of the community could be properly served without the inconvenience which this terminus would create, and if the decision of the matter was left to Members who either represented metropolitan constituencies or dwelt in London, he had no doubt the Amendment would be carried by an overwhelming majority.

*Mr. PEMBERTON (Sunderland) reminded the House that the Committee upstairs were not unanimous in their decision. Personally, he was strongly in favour of a tramway connection between the North and South of London, but such connection should be by sub-way or some other means and not make the existing traffic more dangerous. The points which induced him to vote against the proposal in Committee were the decidedly dangerous character of the crossing at Euston Road, and the fact that, in consequence of a cab-stand and a shelter, there would be a distance of only about ten feet between the cars and the kerb at the north end of Tottenham Court Road.

Mr. JOHN DEWAR (Inverness) said that a consideration which weighed with him on the Committee was that the line was to be made not by a private company for private profit, but by a public authority for the public convenience. The matter had been carefully considered by the County Council and their experts, and all agreed that the construction was highly desirable in the public interest. The last borough election in St. Pancras was fought mainly on this question, with the result that the composition of the Borough Council was completely changed, so strong was the feeling in favour of the proposal in the locality. The only opposition came from the frontagers, who were usually against tramways, although it had not been proved that tramways necessarily harmed the frontagers. As to the danger at Euston Road, there would probably be less danger in crossing in a tramcar than on foot, and as 150 electric tramcars would do the work of 300 omnibuses the condition of the traffic in that neighbourhood would be greatly improved by the adoption of this scheme.

Mr. CREMER (Shoreditch, Haggerston), as a ratepayer of St. Pancras and one who had for thirty years lived within 200 yards of the present terminus, said that for twenty-five years the local authority of the district had had this matter under consideration, but in their desire to get the tramways extended they had always been defeated by the forces in Tottenham Court Road and by the two publicans at the corners of Hampstead Road, who preferred that passengers crossing London should be tempted to patronise their respective establishments by being dumped down at the present terminus. Every effort had been made by the people of St. Pancras to get this improvement carried out, and if ever there was a matter in regard to which attention should be paid to the views of the locality it was the case under consideration. It was monstrous that the time of the House of Commons should be taken up in discussing a matter which had long been sanctioned and urged by the localities concerned, and he earnestly hoped the Amendment would be rejected.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 106; Noes, 135. (Division List No. 143).

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allen, Charles P.
Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herb. Henry
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cremer, William Randal
Crooks, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Donelan, Captain A.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Ellice, Capt E. C. (SAndrw'sBghs
Fenwick, Charles
Ffrench, Peter
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Gardner, Ernest
Gladstone, Rt. Hon. Herbert Jn.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hammond, John
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Horniman, Frederick John
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kennedy, Patrick James
Lambert, George
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
M'Crae, George
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Norman, Henry
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid.)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O'Malley, William
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Rickett, J. Compton
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Runciman, Walter
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R (Northants
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tomkinson, James
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Jn. Cathcart (Orkney)
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse, Sir J. T (Huddersf'd

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. John Burns and Dr. Macnamara.

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir Mich. Hicks

Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Brassey, Albert
Bull, William James
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Charrington, Spencer
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb, Rt. Hon. Sir John C.R.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Charles Curtis(Antrim,S.
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cullinan, J.
Dalkeith, Earl of
Davenport, William Bromley
Davies, Sir H. D. (Chatham
Delany, William
Denny, Colonel
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dickson, Charles Scott
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dimsdale, Rt.Hn.Sir Joseph C.
Dobbie, Joseph
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Dyke, Rt.Hn.Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Forster, Henry William
Foster, P. S. (Warwick, S.W.)
Galloway, William Johnson
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gore, Hn. G. R. C. Ormsby-(Salop
Gore, Hon. S.F. Ormsby-(Linc.)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Hamilton, Marq of(L'nd'nderry
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Dr. Fredk. R. (Dulwich
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hope, J.F.(Sheffield, Brightside
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Keswick, William
Knowles, Sir Lees
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hon. W. (Bristol, S.)
Lowe, Francis William
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Iver, Sir Lewis(Edinburgh, W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Majendie, James A. H.
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell, W.J.H.(Dumfriesshire
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Frederick G.
Milvain, Thomas
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute)
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Pease, Herb. Pike (Darlington)
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Perks, Robert William
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Rankin, Sir James
Reddy, M.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Renwick, George
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rose, Charles Day
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sheehy, David
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Stanley, Hon. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stanley, Edward Jas.(Somerset
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs,
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Valentia, Viscount
Welby, Sir Charles G.E.(Notts.
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W.H.(Yorks.)
Wrightson, Sir Thomas

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Remnant and Captain Jessel.

Bill to be read the third time.

SUPPLY [12TH ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[MR. JEFFREYS (Hampshire, N.) in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1904-5.

CLASS II.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £35,771, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Department of His Majesty's Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs."

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.) asked whether the Government had been following recent events in Crete, and whether they were satisfied that a policy was being pursued which made for peace among the various elements of the population. He also wished to put a question regarding the troubles which had during the last few weeks broken out again in Armenia and the interior of Asia Minor. In view of those fresh troubles and the grave massacres which had taken place, he thought we could hardly remain silent. He desired to know whether the Under-Secretary could give a little more information than he gave across the Table a few days ago, both with regard to action already taken and the action which the Government, in concert, he hoped, with the other Powers, was prepared to take. Some three or four weeks ago the Turkish troops destroyed a number of villages and slaughtered a large number of people, and when the Grand Vizier was asked for an explanation by Sir Nicholas O'Conor, he gave one of those answers which had been given so regularly that they might almost be lithographed—namely, that, owing to revolutionary movements, troops had been marched into the district and there had been some small conflict, but that now an amnesty would be granted to those who had come in and submitted. These attacks were made upon a comparatively defenceless population, and when the people armed themselves and resisted, then the Turkish forces marched in and slaughtered them. All this happened on a very large scale in 1894, when there was a frightful massacre, defended by the Turks on the ground that they were dealing only with one or two revolutionists. A European Commission was sent out there and the culprits were named, but no punishment followed and no displeasure was ever shown by the Government in regard to the persons who perpetrated these horrors. It was perhaps a plausible view to take that the object of these massacres was to exterminate those districts where the Christians were in a majority and that was the idea present in the minds of those who governed Turkey. On this occasion he was glad to learn that some remonstrances were made by Sir Nicholas O'Conor, and that the representatives of Great Britain and France and Russia appeared to be acting together. He was glad that the Russian representative especially was acting, because it was the resistance of Russia which foiled the efforts of Lord Salisbury in 1896. If the Powers were firm and acted together—and he thought it was not too much to expect that France, Italy, and Great Britain would act together—and if, instead of whispered remonstrances, firm language was used, these things would come to an end. He earnestly hoped that the British Government would take the lead, and that they would be able to tell the House that they did not intend to remain indifferent. He might put his appeal simply on the basis of the amount of human suffering which went on in a country which was subject to such constant suffering and such constant massacres; but he would like to put it also on the ground that this state of things was a constant source of danger, and that they could never tell when there might not be an attempt at revolution on a large scale, which would lead to a deluge of blood. He hoped the Under-Secretary would be able to give them some reassuring statement on the subject.

*MR. LOUIS SINCLAIR (Essex, Romford) said there was one point which he wished to bring to the notice of the House. The noble Lord had said that because a British subject had committed several murders in the Congo Free State this was a difficult moment to remonstrate with that Government He did not agree with the Under-Secretary on that point. He wished to emphasise the fact that it was in the Congo Basin alone that such atrocities were committed with impunity. Another point he wished to mention was that the Treaty of Berlin was so badly conceived that there was no machinery provided therein by which pressure could be brought to bear to secure the carrying out of the objects of the Treaty, which was simply disregarded. His main object in rising was to call attention to the commercial Papers dealing with the functions of the Ministries of Commerce in foreign countries. Although he had asked for these Reports in 1902, it took over a year to produce them. The Reports now in the hands of Members were not comprehensive enough. It would be a matter of interest to the House to know that nearly all other countries had Ministries of Commerce and ours was practically the only country without one. The Report placed in their hands was insufficient and did not go to the root of the inquiry which was asked for, and it did not give a full account of the commercial needs of this country. With regard to Somaliland, he understood that thousands of pounds had been spent upon the purchase of camels, and the transport animals were utterly useless for the purpose, while he understood that a large amount of transport of all kinds was still at Berber. He wished to know whether it was a fact that General Manning was so incompetent that even the officers serving under him were on the point of mutiny.

*THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN: Order, order! The Consular question cannot be discussed upon this Vote.

*Mr. LOUIS SINCLAIR said he was only criticising the policy of the Government in trusting for the information which guided the Foreign Office to a gentleman who had not the confidence of his officers. He thought that at the present moment this country was singularly fortunate in having at the head of the Foreign Office statesmen like Lord Lansdowne and his noble friend the Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs. The conciliatory tone of this debate showed that they enjoyed the confidence of both sides of the House, but he thought they would have better results if there was only a little more commercial aptitude introduced into the Foreign Office.

*Earl PERCY: Upon questions relating to the Consular service I will reply on the Consular Vote. With regard to a question raised by the hon. Member for Orkney and Shetland concerning East Africa, the Government do not contemplate any alienation of territory there. It would be premature to lay Papers on the Table before the conditions of the lease, which is all that is contemplated, are determined upon. The hon. Member for King's Lynn complains that the *procès verbal* of the last meeting of the Sugar Commission is not to be found in the Library, but, as the Committee will see, their substance is contained in the covering despatch of Sir Henry Bergne, and the final decision in regard to the surtax has been deferred to a subsequent meeting. I must enter an emphatic protest against the strictures the hon. Member has made on the qualifications and capacity of Sir Henry Bergne. We could not have a better qualified representative, and, as a matter of fact, Sir Henry Bergne is not to blame because unfortunately in his despatch as printed it is stated that the Congress came to a decision that the Russian system did not give rise to a bounty, whereas, in fact, they came to an opposite decision. It is an unfortunate typographical error that crept into the text. The error is not in the written despatch, and if hon. Members will remember the mass of printed Papers that are prepared by the Foreign Office at very short notice, it is not surprising that a trifling error should occasionally occur. [An Hon. Member: It is not a trifling error.] It is trifling in the sense that anybody who reads the despatch will see from the context that it is a typographical error. The hon. Member is wrong when he says that foreign countries have been enabled by the Convention to penalise British colonies which export bounty-fed sugar-products. As a matter of fact they do not export, and even if they did the Convention has made no change in this respect. I have also been asked whether the Government intend to take any steps to prevent sugared products which have received a bounty from entering this country.

Mr. LOUGH (Islington, W.): You said you would take prompt steps.

*Earl PERCY: If it should be found that any quantity of such products found their way to this country.

Mr. WHITLEY (Halifax) asked if other countries had not already put a surtax on our sugared products.

*Earl PERCY: There never was anything to prevent other countries putting on such a tax. The right hon. Gentleman opposite has asked if I can say anything in regard to Crete. He seems to think that there is some chance of disturbances arising there. We have no information to that effect. The only question which has raised any serious difficulty has been that of the Cretan indemnities. The arrangement that has been come to in regard to these indemnities is that, on condition that the Cretans will put aside a sum of 1,000,000f. for the settlement of foreign claims, a sum of 5,000,000f. will be set aside for the satisfaction of the Cretan and Greek claims, and that that sum will be met out of a loan to be raised on the security of a guarantee by the Powers for a prolongation of the surtax which has already been sanctioned until the loan has been paid off. The right hon. Gentleman also asked me whether I could give him any information as to what was going on in Armenia. I do not think he asked me about Macedonia, but perhaps I may anticipate any question on that subject by observing that we have already discussed it three times during the present session, and I am afraid there is nothing to add to the information we have already given to the House. I do not deprecate the raising of the question, because I think it is extremely important that it should be made known that the House of Commons continues to take an interest in the settlement of this problem, but no one will seriously expect that we can announce any startling progress from week to week in regard to the scheme for the re-organisation of the Turkish *gendarmerie*. In order to carry out a scheme of that kind some time is required for our officers to acquaint themselves with the present conditions of service in the force, with the character of the *personnel*, and with the nature of the changes which will have to be made. I can assure the right hon. Gentleman that our expectations in regard to this re-organisation, so far as our own area is concerned —and that is the only area in regard to which we have any detailed information —have been more than fulfilled. Colonel Fairholme has reported that he and his fellow officers have been received with the greatest cordiality by the Turks and have received all the assistance which they could possibly have expected from all classes of officials. Till now the Civil Assessors have been engaged in elaborating in detail the scheme of civil administrative reforms. I doubt whether the Turkish Government will insist upon putting obstacles in the way of the Civil Assessors if they desire to undertake tours of inspection on their own account, unaccompanied by Turkish officials. With regard to Armenia I can add nothing to what I said on the Motion for adjournment at Whitsuntide.

Mr. BRYCE: A great deal has happened since then.

* **EARL PERCY**: The right hon. Gentleman refers, of course, to the reports which have appeared in the public Press. How far these are based on facts it is impossible for us to judge accurately at the present moment. As far back as February last our Consul at Erzeroum reported a serious condition of unrest in the neighbourhood of Mush and Sassun. We thereupon made representations to the Sultan to abstain from any measures which were likely to produce disturbance. Shortly after that it was suggested that it might be well to invite the assistance of the Armenian Patriarch in placing the Turks in communication with the insurgents. The Sultan accepted that suggestion and the Bishops of Mush and Bitlis were instructed to attempt to confer with the leaders. On two separate occasions they have made the attempt, and on both these occasions the Armenians have rejected their overtures. Apparently the Armenian Patriarch represented from the outset that he thought mediation of that character would be more likely to be successful if the Bishops were accompanied by a Turkish military official. This suggestion was refused and the Armenians at Sassun rejected the proposals made to them on the ground that they did not consider the guarantee for their safe conduct sufficient. We also suggested that, failing mediation by the Bishops, the task might be committed to our own Consul, in conjunction with the French and Russian representatives. That course was agreed upon after some negotiation with the two Governments. The French Government instructed their representative to proceed to Mush where our representative already was. The Russian representative has been unfortunately detained for some weeks at Tiflis, and has not yet arrived. I am bound to say that if he had arrived I do not think the offer of mediation by the Consuls would have had much prospect of success at the present moment, because the insurgents are dispersed. There was an affray between the Armenian and the Turkish troops in the course of which, according to the Turks, about forty-two Turkish soldiers were killed, and some eleven villages were destroyed. There are at present in the town of Mush 1,000 Armenian refugees, for whom the Turkish Government have sent out relief. I will only say, in conclusion, in regard to the Armenian question, that I must dissent from the view which the right hon. Gentleman always takes on this question. I think that very often the action of the Turkish Government in these matters is very ill-advised, and that when affairs have

proceeded to an extremity their conduct is open to far severer strictures. But there is no use in disguising the fact that in these troubles between the Turks and the Armenians there is ground for believing that the Armenians to a certain extent are to blame. No one can doubt—it has been avowed over and over again—that the aims of the revolutionary committees are to make incursions into Turkish territory, to create disturbances, to provoke the Turks to commit atrocities, and then to point to those atrocities as a reason for invoking the intervention of Europe.

Mr. BRYCE: Of course we do not know the facts yet about the recent troubles, but that was certainly not the case in 1894. There was no incursion from outside, and the massacre then was entirely wanton on the part of the Turks. That has never been disputed.

*Earl PERCY: I will not dispute what the right hon. Gentleman says if he limits it to Sassun, but it is certainly not the case if he extends that observation to the whole series of atrocities which occurred in those Armenian vilayets which border on Russian territory. But apart altogether from any question of justice to the Turkish Government, knowing what the aims of the revolutionary committees are, I cannot imagine anything more disastrous than that any Member of Parliament, however much he may be actuated by humanitarian sentiments, should allow it to be supposed for a moment that the British Government and the House of Commons are going to allow themselves to be made in this way the catspaw of revolutionary intrigue. The right hon. Gentleman has complained of His Majesty's Government not using language of proper severity. It may be right to employ severe language when the action that is to follow it has been decided on; but I am all against the use of it when it can carry little conviction to those who know the small extent of our personal interests in these regions, and can only mislead the revolutionaries into the belief that the British Government will come to their support. The sufferers are not those who provoke the atrocities, but the unhappy people who are supposed to be in complicity with the movement.

Mr. JOHN CAMPBELL (Armagh, S.) said the hon. Members who had addressed the House in regard to the administration of the Congo had used very strong expressions in denouncing certain acts which were alleged to have occurred there. He thought some of the statements which had been made were superfluous, and that there had been too much protesting altogether. The late Sir Henry Stanley had said that the sentiment which inspired the charges against the Congo was jealousy. The Congo had succeeded better than any other State in Africa. The Committee had heard a great deal to-day about the cause of humanity, but he had during his own short political experience heard enough to make him doubt that kind of philanthropic preaching. It was said in regard to the Transvaal when the war commenced that the British did not seek the goldfields or any addition of territory. They now knew what had been the result of that affirmation. The religious motive had been brought on to the carpet in connection with the charges made against the Congo. He had no desire to drag in the *odium theologicum*, but he wished to point out that Belgium was a Catholic State, and that the charges against the Congo had been formulated in great part by Protestant missionaries of various kinds.

And, it being Midnight, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon Monday next.

MILITARY MANŒUVRES (ORDER IN COUNCIL).

Resolved, That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty, praying His Majesty to make the Order in Council under The Military Manœuvres Act, 1897, a draft of which was presented to this House on the 9th day of March last.—(*Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*)

To be presented by Privy Councillors and Members of His Majesty's Household.

Adjourned at four Minutes after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Friday, 10th June, 1904.

SAT FIRST.

The Lord Oxenfoord (*E. Stair*)—Sat first in Parliament after the death of his father.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR aquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificate from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with:—London and India Docks Company. The same was ordered to lie on the Table.

Manchester Ship Canal Bill [H.L.]. The King's consent signified; and Bill reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments.

Stretford Urban District Council Bill [H.L.]. Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments.

King's College Hospital Bill [H.L.]; Wolverhampton Corporation Bill. Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments.

Great Northern Railway Bill; Midland Railway Bill. Reported, with Amendments.

London and North-Western Railway Bill. Report from the Select Committee, That the Committee had not proceeded with the consideration of the Bill, no parties having appeared in opposition thereto; read, and ordered to lie on the Table. The orders made on the 28th of April and 17th of May last discharged, and Bill committed.

Lothians Electric Power Bill [H.L.]. Read 3^a, and passed, and sent to the Commons.

Littlestone-on-Sea and District Water Bill; Brixham Gas Bill; Acton Improvement Bill. Read 3^a, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

Torquay Tramways Bill; Charing Cross, Euston, and Hampstead Railway Bill; Baker Street and Waterloo Railway Bill; Soothill Nether Urban District Tramways Bill; Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [H.L.]. Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Lord Seaton be proposed to the House as a member of the Select Committee on the said Bills in the place of the Lord Deramore; read, and agreed to.

Oakengates, Dawley, and District Joint Water Board Bill [H.L.]; Humber Commercial Railway and Dock Bill; Great Central Railway Bill; Canal Rates and Charges (Regents Canal) Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]; Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [H.L.]. Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Lord Monson be proposed to the House as a member of the Select Committee on the said Bills in the place of the Marquess of Exeter; read, and agreed to.

North-Western Electricity and Power Gas Bill; Skipton Water and Improvement Bill. Brought from the Commons; read 1^a; and referred to the Examiners.

Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [H.L.]; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill [H.L.]; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill [H.L.]; Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [H.L.]. Read 2^a (according to order).

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill; Local Government Provisional Order (Poor Law) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill. Read 3^a (according to order), and passed.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill. Amendment reported (according to order), and Bill to be read 3^a on Monday next.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRADE REPORTS—I. ANNUAL SERIES.

No. 3180. Denmark.
No 3181. France (Cochin China).
No. 3182. Persia (the Persian Gulf).

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

II. MISCELLANEOUS SERIES.

No. 612. Customs Tariff of Belgium.

ELECTRIC LIGHTING ACTS, 1882 AND 1888.

Special reports by the Board of Trade under Section 1 of the Electric Lighting Act, 1888.

DUBLIN HOSPITALS.

Forty-sixth Report of the Board of Superintendence, with appendices, for the year 1903–1904.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

MERCHANT SEAMEN'S FUND.

Account of the receipts and expenditure under the Seamen's Fund Winding-up Act, from 1st January to 31st December, 1903.

SUPERANNUATION.

Treasury minute, dated 26th May, 1904, declaring that Thomas Tootell, letter carrier, Post Office, was appointed without a Civil Service certificate through inadvertence on the part of the head of his Department.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

NEW BILLS.

RESERVE FORCES BILL [H.L.] (No. 95.).

A Bill to amend the law relating to the Reserve Forces. And

NAVAL AND MILITARY MEDALS BILL [H.L.] (No. 96).

A Bill to regulate and restrict the wearing of Naval and Military Medals and Decorations—Were presented by the Viscount Hutchinson (*E. Donoughmore*); read 1^a; to be printed; and to be read 2^a on Tuesday next.

MERCHANT SHIPPING ACT, 1894, AMENDMENT BILL [H.L.].

A Bill to amend the Merchant Shipping Act, 1894—Was presented by the Lord Muskerry; read 1^a; and to be printed. (No. 97.)

CROWN AGENTS OF THE COLONIES.

*THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH, who had given notice to move—

> "That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the system by which the Crown Agents of the Colonies are paid, and their methods of transacting the duties attaching to their office,"

said: My Lords, since I brought this question before your Lordships' House in February last, I have received an enormous mass of communications from the Colonies and from merchants and various organisations interested in the matter. I hope that if I give but few figures and details you will not on that account imagine that I am not prepared to substantiate every statement I make; but I feel that I should be unduly trespassing on your Lordships' indulgence if I were to go into details. I shall, therefore, confine myself to certain leading facts which I think will justify the Motion I have placed on the Paper. At the same time I wish it to be clearly understood that I admit that under certain conditions and for certain purposes Crown Agents are necessary. The point upon which I desire to criticise their conduct is in having, as it were, set up a sort of Government trade department instead of adopting the system in force, in private and commercial concerns, of open tenders.

I think it will be for the convenience of your Lordships if I state, as clearly and as concisely as I can, various incidents that have occurred in different Crown colonies which have caused the colonists to be very dissatisfied with the conduct of the Crown Agents. If there are any of your Lordships who do not understand exactly the position of the Crown Agents Office, I might explain that the Crown Agents do all the work of the Government, in buying stores and in constructing railways and public improvements for the Crown Colonies, which in our self-governing colonies is done by the colonies themselves, and which in India and Egypt is put up to open tender.

The first colony to which I shall allude is British Honduras. The attitude of the Crown Agents in regard to that colony has been one of delay and obstruction. The colonists of British Honduras have for a long time desired to have a railway from the Port of Belize into the hinterland, and from thence a little distance into the territory of Guatemala, the object, of course, being to enable them to bring down to the coast the various timbers which are the main industry of that colony. A line was surveyed by a Mr. Shelford, of the firm who act as consulting engineers to the Crown Agents and the Colonial Office. In his report of the projected line Mr. Shelford spoke of the country as an "easy country," and yet the expenditure which they estimated it would be needful to incur in making the railway was put at £734,000. That seems to me, on the face of it, to be rather a preposterous estimate. The colonists themselves objected to the cost, and agreed to pay a reasonable sum to any private contractor for constructing a substantial and less expensive line. A London engineering firm undertook to build and equip a short line, which would have satisfied the requirements of the colony, for a sum under £80,000. The Crown Agents, however, raised objection, and so far no line has been made. That is an instance in that colony of the obstructive attitude of the Crown Agents.

Now let us go to another colony, perhaps the most important of all our Crown Colonies—Ceylon. In Ceylon not only is all the material purchased through the Crown Agents, but the Crown Agents even have their own workshops. As showing the feeling of the colony with regard to this matter, I would read to your Lordships an extract from an article in the *Ceylon Observer*, which is, perhaps, the leading newspaper in the colony—

> "What is found to answer so well in India, the Straits, and Natal, not to mention other colonies, cannot be disadvantageous in the case of Ceylon. The large amount of capital invested in engineering and ironwork establishments throughout the colony, and the keen competition in this direction, as well as in mercantile and industrial enterprise, afford a quite sufficient guarantee for the execution of work and orders by contract, to the satisfaction of the Government and the public."

In Ceylon what I think is a very doubtful and objectionable system prevails—the Government have their own workshops and carry out the work themselves. They do not put it up to public contract at all. The Ceylon Public Works Department carries out all the public works in the colony. All material which is imported for such works is obtained through the Crown Agents. There are in Ceylon Government engineering workshops, known as the Government factory. I am puzzled to discover why this condition of things should exist in Ceylon when there is no such establishment in Singapore, in Hong-Kong, or in any other Crown colony.

We may be told that the work carried on in these Government workshops is less costly and of a higher class. Well, I have specific cases to show that that is not so. Let us take the case of the contract for the Post Office in Ceylon. Specifications and drawings were made in the office of the Public Works Department, and the work was put out to tender. Tenders were received from private contractors for the building, to be erected in accordance with these plans and specifications, but they were rejected on the ground that they were above the estimate of the Public Works Department. Now what happened? The Public Works Department had greatly under-estimated the cost, and therefore had to ask the colony to make up the difference, amounting to a large sum. Of course, if this had been put out to open tender, subject to proper inspection and control, the contractors would have had to bear the loss, but as it was the colony had to bear it. Besides the increased expenditure in money, the Public Works Department took twelve months longer to complete the work than was estimated as the time they would require by the contractors. Not only was this the case, but the specification to which the contractors had to tender as regards the quality of the material and so forth was not adhered to by the Public Works Department.

Let me give one more instance which happened in Ceylon. In the case of the Haputale Hospital, a firm of engineers were asked to tender for its erection. Their estimate was Rs.87,000. The Director of the Public Works Department said this estimate was too high, the Department's estimate being only Rs.75,000. Accordingly the Crown Agents did the work, but the condition of things which obtained in the case of the Post Office was repeated. The Crown Agents required two Supplementary Votes from the Legislative Council in order to carry out the work, bringing the total cost to over Rs.100,000—a sum considerably in excess of that for which an estimate had been given by a first-class firm of engineers. In the specification sent out to the contractors it was required that teak wood should be used throughout, and the contractors provided for this in their estimate of Rs.87,000; but the Public Works Department not only expended over Rs.13,000 more, but used jungle timber very largely.

I have before me a quite recent case. I am not justified in mentioning the name of the merchant, but it is a perfectly *bona-fide* case. I have it on the authority, personally given, of one of the leading merchants in Ceylon. This is his statement. An engineering firm in one of our Crown colonies lately received an order to import some machinery required in connection with a certain work the Government of the colony had in hand. In due course the London agents of this firm placed the order with the makers of the machinery. When the invoice for the same was received, it was found that 15 per cent. discount was allowed off the list price. On being asked if these were the exact terms the furnishers would have quoted had they received the order from the Crown Agents, the reply was that they were not, as they did not allow the Crown Agents any discount owing to the number of restrictions and conditions which they (the Crown Agents) attached to all orders, and which gave the manufacturers a considerable amount of extra trouble.

I now come to a case in another colony—the Gold Coast Government Railway. That railway was constructed by Mr. Shelford, the consulting engineer to the Crown Agents. Mr. Shelford stated, in the paper which he read recently before the Royal Colonial Institute, that the average cost of what he was pleased to call this "light railway" was £10,300 per mile—a ridiculously exorbitant price. Messrs. Pauling and Co., who are, perhaps, more experienced in the construction of railways in South Africa than any other firm, offered to construct the Gold Coast line, for which the Crown Agents charged £10,300 a mile, for £6,500 a mile, and I wish to know why their offer was not accepted? The offer, however, was not accepted, and the Crown Agents constructed the line. And what sort of a line did they make? They made one of the most notoriously bad lines that has ever been made. I will read to your Lordships a letter on this subject from a gentleman of great experience, Mr. N. G. Lowe, who, writing from Sekondi, says—

> "We have had terrible work with the railway since it has been taken over. It certainly did not start well, and owing to the breakdown of a bridge, on which occasion a white driver and four natives were killed, traffic was stopped for ten days even though this was thirty-two and three-quarter miles beyond Tarkwa, and the restrictions placed on us now with the new regulations entail considerably more work than previously. We are unable to load and dispatch trucks with anything like the same rapidity with which we were able to do it when working under the construction. No trains are now allowed to run after dark."

And why are they not allowed to run after dark? This regulation was enforced because the construction of the railway was so bad that the drivers refused to take the risk of driving after dark. Mr. Lowe continued—

> "I went up to Dunkwa last Tuesday, but owing to derailments it took me just on twenty-nine hours to go a distance of ninety-nine miles. We were also derailed upon our return journey yesterday. A very great deal of work will have to be done to put the line in anything like working order, and, unfortunately, the open lines-men are all new, and therefore without the benefit of past experience on the line."

That is an example of one of the lines constructed by the Crown Agents as against the open tender. But there is another point in regard to this precious line. I hold in my hand a return which I have had made out with a great deal of care, showing the various rates per ton per mile that the different railways charge. It is of great public importance in the development of these countries that the railway rates should be as cheap and as reasonable as possible. I have compared the rates upon the British Gold Coast line with those on many other lines in South Africa, and I find that the rate per ton per mile is 2s. 6d., as compared with 6d. on the Cape Colony line, and 1s. 11d. 1s. 3d., and 3¾d. respectively on the lines made by the French in French territory. These facts, it seems to me, ought to be carefully investigated by an impartial Committee.

Now that we are upon this subject, I feel bound to make some reference to the very remarkable character of the *personnel* of the Crown Agents' Office and the Colonial Office. I am perfectly well aware that both my right hon. friend the Secretary of State and the noble Duke opposite are anxious in every way to serve the public interest, but what I do complain of is that the Colonial Office in its permanent departments is not a check upon the Crown Agents. In other words, there exists in a most curious and remarkable degree a sort of family party in the Crown Agents' Department and the Colonial Office. The Permanent Under-Secretary for the Colonies is Sir Montague Ommanney. Mr. Ommanney, a nephew of Sir Montague Ommanney, is a member of a firm of solicitors who are solicitors to the Crown Agents. Mr. Shelford, who constructed the precious and costly line to which I have referred, is son-in-law to Sir Montague Ommanney, and is himself a member of the firm of Messrs. Shelford, who are also the consulting engineers to the Crown Agents. If I may say so, that is rather like a condition of things borrowed from the comic operas of Gilbert and Sullivan. First of all, the work of the Crown Agents is handed over to delegated constructors selected by them, and then they are paid besides for the duty of reporting on their own work. That seems to me to be a condition of things which in the public interest is quite indefensible, and I think it certainly should be carefully and fully inquired into.

Now I come to the case of the Transvaal, and I shall ask your Lordships' attention to the strong feeling which was expressed and the strong resolutions unanimously passed at the Johannesburg Chamber of Commerce in April last. I have no desire to quote to your Lordships the somewhat full-flavoured language used on that occasion, but the meeting consisted of the most prominent members of different firms throughout the Transvaal, and one or two very remarkable statements were made at that meeting and publicly reported. The meeting unanimously protested against the action of the Colonial Office in insisting upon all materials and articles being purchased through the Crown Agents. A Mr. Mitchell, of the firm of Gordon, Mitchell, and Co., stated that orders sent through Crown Agents had taken as long as twelve months to execute, whereas local traders were bound down by a restricted period of three or four months. Mr. Park said—and this is a most extraordinary statement—that Government officials had actually come to ask him to get out goods already ordered from the Crown Agents, but which the officials knew would not arrive in time. This protest of the Johannesburg Chamber of Commerce is supported by all the other chambers of commerce in the colony and in Orangia. The colonists feel particularly aggrieved, and, I think, naturally, that they should be compelled to submit to this state of things after the language used by Mr. Chamberlain, who promised the Transvaal that, to all intents and purposes, they should be treated as a self-governing colony. My right hon. friend the present Secretary of State for the Colonies as recently as January last stated that—

> "The only safe way of dealing with our self-governing colonies is never to interfere with their wishes, unless Imperial interests are vitally concerned. This is true even of our Crown colonies. We ought never to forget that each of these great States has its own life, its own policy, and its own methods. So long as this fact is kept in view, the Empire will possess the surest foundations and ideal aspirations."

Surely it is not an unreasonable contention on the part of the Transvaal that they should enjoy the same opportunities as the Cape and Natal enjoy of being master of their own improvements, and not be tied down to an office in London.

The people in the Transvaal have a very lively recollection of the objectionable system of the Crown Agents which now prevails in our other African Crown colonies. In our West African colonies a certain brand of cement is the only one allowed to be shipped by them. There may be climatic conditions why this particular brand is the only one that ought to be used; but the most extraordinary proceeding, from a business point of view, is this, that the Crown Agents do not buy direct from the supplier, but from a steamship owner, delivered at the port at which they want it. What is the effect of this? The shipowner gets the supplier to give him a monopoly of that particular brand for the West Coast, and consequently is not put into competition either in regard to freight or first cost of the material. I see my noble friend Lord Londonderry opposite, and I should like to call his attention to the position as regards coal. The Crown Agents do not buy direct from the colliery owners and then see what they can do in the way of getting a cheap freight; they buy direct from the shipowner. As regards timber, there is this extraordinary state of things. Pensacolan pitch-pine, Swedish spruce, American pine—in fact, all timbers from all parts of the world—are bought for the West Coast of Africa *viâ* Liverpool, and are not delivered at the ports where required direct from the supplier.

The volume of trade which passes through the hands of the Crown Agents is enormous. Sir Henry Fowler obtained a statement from the Secretary of State that in the case of the Transvaal and Orange River Colony alone, for 1903, nearly £2,000,000 worth of goods were purchased by the Crown Agents. I contend that the Crown Agents ought to be strong enough and capable enough to make their own contracts with the suppliers and be independent of particular steamship companies. This question of freights is a very anxious and serious one in the development of South Africa. I do not know whether your Lordships are aware of the ingenious condition of things which has been created by a certain ring of shipowners in Liverpool. What they do is this. They say to the merchants, We will give you a rebate upon your freights of 10 per cent., but this rebate is not a discount; you are not to receive it at once, but it is to be held in suspense—in some cases for as long as a year and a half—and if during that time you ship any goods by any other line than ours you lose the rebate. That seems to me to be a scandalous condition of things, and I say that this policy on the part of the Crown Agents is only playing into the hands of the ring. It is true that the Crown Agents affected to offer Government freights to firms outside the ring, but they rendered that offer nugatory by the ridiculous proviso which they attached to it, the proviso being that in tendering the firms were to be prepared to ship goods from any port in the United Kingdom. How could you expect a merchant, say, in London, Southampton, or Liverpool suddenly, at a moment's notice, to ship freight from Middlesbrough, Bristol, or Aberdeen? Why were not tenders invited for the specific shipping of goods at named ports?

I have mentioned the case of colonies which have suffered under the present system, and I have in each case given leading facts and figures. I should like, however, before I sit down to make some reference to the statements made by the noble Duke the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies in the debate which took place when I last brought this subject forward. The noble Duke then said—

> "I would point out to the noble Earl that the Crown Agents do not receive money from the Imperial Exchequer."

Well, my Lords, even if they do not, I do not think that is much of an argument against vigilance on our part, for we are trustees for the colonies which do not possess self-government. But I entirely take issue with the noble Duke on that statement. First of all, it was computed by the Foreign Office, and they allowed Sir H. Johnston to publish the information in a Blue-book and also in his work on the Uganda Protectorate, that the Uganda Railway might have been constructed for about £750,000 cheaper than the actual cost of construction. Of course, that loss came out of our pockets. We grant large sums of money to certain protectorates. Northern Nigeria receives some £300,000 or more annually from the Imperial Exchequer, and the supplies for this protectorate are entirely obtained through the Crown Agents. Therefore if the price paid is high, and the system wasteful, there is an annual loss to the taxpayers of this country.

I should like to again press the question of commission. The noble Duke spoke of the Crown Agents being entitled to a commission of 1 per cent. I want to know what that 1 per cent. commission includes. The Crown Agents Office does not possess any great technical knowledge. It has to buy goods and materials of all kinds, and must employ expert buyers. Are they allowed no commission? I am informed, on high authority, that the Crown Agents' charges are, as the noble Duke said, 1 per cent. for anything they do., ½ per cent. on loans issued, ½ per cent. on repayment of loans, 1 per cent. on all orders executed by their Office, and, if this is for railway construction, then another 5 per cent. on all material ordered for such railway construction, and 2½ per cent. for inspection of any such railway material charged by the consulting engineers, making at least 10½ per cent., besides solicitors' fees, which are charged on any railway construction carried out under the Crown Agents' Office.

In purchasing goods on a large scale you have two very important elements to consider, not merely the question of price but the question of trade discount and also cash discount. I happen to buy largely for my different estates, and I know that on some material I get a trade discount, buying in a large way, of as much as 75 per cent. trade discount and 2½ per cent. cash discount, in all 77½. The Crown Agents, buying on a much larger scale, ought to get this trade discount. What I want to ask is, Do the Crown Agents get these trade and cash discounts, and, if they do, do the Colonies obtain the full benefit of them? As I have said, I do not wish for a Committee for the purpose of abolishing the Office of Crown Agents. I desire the Committee to bring to light the manner in which that Office is conducted, and especially to consider whether it would not be better to have a more rational and commercial system. The Crown Agents' Office has not got any special technical knowledge, and you can only get the best of that technical knowledge checked and controlled by putting things up to public contract. Nothing can be worse than having these Government workshops and this close list of firms who alone are allowed to tender. One of the most successful Administrations which has existed has been probably the Administration of Lord Cromer in Egypt. Lord Cromer is allowed to buy whatever is required in the cheapest market. What is the view of the Indian Government? Lord Curzon said, in a speech delivered in January, 1903, on the occasion of visiting the collieries at Katrasgarh—

> "I do hope that India will become much more of a self-providing country than she now is, manufacturing out of her own materials and with her own workmen a great deal that she now imports from abroad."

That would be impossible under the Crown Agents' system. The Madras Government last September issued an order to the effect that tenders for all Government works of importance requiring engineering plant would be, in future, publicly advertised for, and other things being equal, preference would be given to local firms, provided the interests of the Government were not sacrificed thereby.

I have now, my Lords, told my tale. I am afraid it has been rather a long one, but I have had to deal with a great many facts and figures. What I want to impress upon your Lordships is that in supporting the Motion which I now move you are only supporting the appointment of an impartial Committee. I hope that the Committee, if appointed, will not be guided by any political or Party bias, but will impartially examine into the facts of the case. It seems to me that, from the facts I have mentioned, and which I can prove, there are strong grounds to justify such an inquiry, and there is, moreover, a very acute feeling of irritation throughout our Colonial Empire. On these grounds I hope the Government will agree to the appointment of this Committee. I have every confidence that my right hon. friend the Secretary of State is anxious to act most fairly in the matter, and I cannot imagine that he would desire to shelve inquiry or give any but the fullest information on the subject.

Moved, "That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the system by which the Crown Agents of the Colonies are paid, and their methods of transacting the duties attaching to their office."—(*The Earl of Portsmouth.*)

*EARL GREY: My Lords, I regret that the noble Earl towards the end of his speech made use of language which I cannot help thinking will convey an impression to some that the Crown Agents have a pecuniary interest in raising the cost of works for which they are responsible. I do not think that can have been his intention, because we have been informed by the noble Duke the Under-Secretary for the Colonies—and the regulations which have been distributed leave no doubt upon the subject—that the remuneration of the Crown Agents is fixed by the Secretary of State, and that the commissions which are very properly charged to he various

Colonies for work executed in them goes to a fund regulated, as I understand, by the Secretary of State. I associate myself with the noble Earl in regard to the rest of his speech, which I cannot help thinking has made a powerful impression upon the House. I make no imputation whatever against the personal honour of the Crown Agents. I believe they are as honourable a body of men as any in His Majesty's Service. But when we remember that the work of the Crown Agents' Department has increased very largely of late years, and that the Office is not paid for by British taxpayers—although I admit that work done in too costly a manner may involve heavy taxation which the British taxpayer has to pay—but the cost of the work is debited to the Crown colonies concerned, it will be recognised that we have a special duty to our colonial subjects to convince them that the methods employed by the Crown Agents' Office are up-to-date business methods and that the work is done as efficiently and economically as possible. I have no reason to suppose that the Crown Agents would not themselves welcome an inquiry which could not fail to strengthen their hands and inspire an increased confidence in their methods.

I am glad that the noble Earl abstained from suggesting that the policy of placing orders for stores and material in London through the Crown Agents is injurious to the public service. In that part of the Empire with which I am chiefly concerned a reduction in the cost of living is the first essential; and I think it is quite possible that in parts of South Africa the interests of the local merchant may be strongly opposed to the interests of the consumer, and that the Crown Agents, by placing their orders in London, may be able to safeguard the interests of the consumer more efficiently than if those orders were placed in South Africa itself. It is in other departments of the Crown Agents' Office that I think an impartial inquiry is really required. The noble Earl has pointed out in some detail—and I could supplement what he said if I chose to weary your Lordships—that departmental construction by the Crown Agents is as a rule costly. If the principle adopted with success by the Government of India were adopted in Ceylon and in our other Crown colonies, it is my firm belief that the work would be done better and cheaper than it is to-day. I am not going to refer to the subject of railway construction—it is a big subject, and one which I think on some afternoon might well occupy the attention of the House—but I cannot refrain, having made some investigation into this question, from giving expression to my belief that whether you look to West Africa, East Africa, the Federated States, or the West Indies, you will find that railway and other works that have been departmentally constructed under the Crown Agents have cost more than they were estimated to cost; and if the Crown Agents were responsible for excess over the original estimates, as a firm of contractors would be, they would have to meet very large sums of money which now have to be found by the taxpayers of this country and of the Crown Colonies. I suggest that on another afternoon I may be permitted to move for a Return giving for the last ten or fifteen years the various works carried out by the Crown Agents in the different colonies, together with the original estimate of their cost and the actual amount expended.

But I wish to confine my remarks to-day to that part of the Crown Agents' Department which is concerned in the placing of freight contracts. I believe that the Crown Agents, owing to excess of caution and want of boldness, are responsible for keeping up the system at present obtaining, which operates as a direct restraint on trade, diverts trade which properly belongs to the United Kingdom to America, raises rates for transportation services by artificial methods, and is indirectly instrumental in increasing the cost of living in South Africa. The noble Earl has explained what the system of the Conference Lines is. In addition to their fixed rate they add a further 10 per cent., and then, after the lapse of six months, and, in some cases, as long a period as twelve and eighteen months, that extra 10 per cent, is given back to the shipper on condition that he has not sent one ton of cargo in the interval by a competing line. The shipper is further penalised by an intimation that if he sends any cargo by a competing line the Conference Lines will not convey goods for him except at a prohibitive price. The result of this system is that freights from the port of New York are one-half or one-third the amount of freights from ports in the United Kingdom. I will read to your Lordships a letter from the secretary of the Prince Line, Ltd., a firm of British steamship owners. It is dated 6th May this year, and addressed to the secretary of the Chamber of Commerce of Leeds—

> "Referring to my conversation with you recently with regard to the difficult position in which the British manufacturers seeking to do business in South Africa are placed in consequence of the much lower rates of freight ruling in New York for South Africa, you will be pleased to know that, with a view to helping our manufacturers as far as possible, we have decided to take goods for delivery in South Africa by our 'Saxon Prince,' which vessel will load in Manchester in the early days of June for South Africa, *viâ* New York. We may further state that it is our intention that the 'Saxon Prince' shall be followed by other steamers taking cargo from the United Kingdom to South Africa, *viâ* New York."

This system of penalising shippers who use competing lines in the way I have described under the rebate system is directly driving to America trade which belongs to this country.

The only argument that I have seen against placing freight contracts, as the Indian Government does, in the open market is the statement of Mr. Chamberlain, who pointed out that the acceptance of a casual tender would place the Crown Agents or any other shipper absolutely at the mercy of the Conference Lines. I believe that fear to be absolutely unwarranted. I can speak from personal experience of Rhodesia, where, although we have only 12,000 white population, we were able, by fighting the Conference Lines, to obtain a rate £2 below that which the Conference Lines had previously charged; and if you can save £2, or even £1 per ton, on the tonnage going into a young country you aid considerably the development of that country. I would, therefore, strongly urge your Lordships to support this Motion, which asks that an inquiry should be made into the way in which the Crown Agents carry on the business entrusted to that Department. It is their practice in placing freight contracts to go to a selected list of shipowners, with the result which I have explained. Why do they not follow the example of the Indian Government, who advertise their requirements every Friday? They post up their requirements, stating exactly the nature of the consignments and the ports from which they are to be shipped. The tenders come in on the following Tuesday, and the answers are sent next day. Why cannot that practice be adopted by the Crown Agents in doing business for our Crown colonies?

As I told your Lordships last year, one firm of shipowners is continually carrying freights for the Indian Government to Calcutta, but has never had a chance of quoting for a freight contract for Colombo because Colombo is under the Crown Agents. It is the invariable custom of the Crown Agents to place their contracts with the Conference Lines. Last year the noble Duke the Under-Secretary offered to meet the demand which I then pressed upon your Lordships, and he stated that the Crown Agents were going to invite all shipowners to tender to carry goods to South Africa. But none of the independent shipowners responded. The reason is to be found in the fact that the form of contract made it impossible for any business man to look at it. Under the form of contract issued the contractor had to undertake to carry 60,000 tons to South African ports, with the condition that the Crown Agents should have the option of forcing him to carry an additional 60,000 tons, but reserving to themselves the right to ship outside. It was a "Heads I win, tails you lose" arrangement. Another condition was that the rate should be uniform on all packages. As your lordships are aware, there are profitable freights and unprofitable freights, and to ask business men to expose themselves to the liability of being compelled by the Crown Agents to carry all unremunerative freights whilst the remunerative freights could be placed outside, was most unreasonable. It was an arrangement which no business firm would for a moment consider.

Under the contract the person tendering was liable, at three weeks' notice, to be required to call at any harbour where the Government had collected 500 tons — that is to say, he might be compelled to call at four different ports and take up 2,000 tons. The harbour dues would reach £300, roughly, in each case, or £1,200 for the 2,000 tons; and then he would have to sail to South Africa without any more cargo, for the contract provided that the shipowner should not call at any ports after shipping the Crown Agents' goods. In their anxiety to safeguard His Majesty's Government and to obtain the best terms possible, the Crown Agents invented a form of contract which was really beside the mark, and was at once placed in the rubbish basket. The Agent-General of Cape Colony gave an exactly similar offer, but as no responses came he has now withdrawn it and substituted a reasonable form of contract and one more closely resembling that adopted by the Government of India. If in placing their freight contracts the Crown Agents had adopted the practice which has been successfully carried on for years by the Government of India, they would have secured for British manufacturers the cheap rate of 10s. per ton to South African ports which the Houston and Prince Lines gave to New York shippers for nine or ten months with this result, that a large amount of trade which ought to have been kept in England was made a present of to New York.

Mr. Birchenough, in a capable Report which is known to your Lordships, stated that—

> "After careful inquiry I am convinced that no single circumstance has done so much to promote the growth of American trade during the last twelve months as these low freight charges between America and South African ports. It is pleasant to reflect that they are the result of the action of British and not of foreign steamship companies."

I would add that even less pleasant is it to reflect that this action of the British steamship companies was absolutely necessitated by the ultra prudence, I might almost call it cowardice, of the Crown Agents. When we reflect that the Crown Agents are not responsible to Parliament we ought to be most jealous in this matter. If they were controlled by the Colonies I believe this scandal would not have occurred. I am glad to see that the inhabitants of South Africa are now organising a hostile movement against the shipping of Government freights by lines which practice this system of rebate. The House of Assembly at Pietermaritzburg actually marked their disapprobation of the freight arrangements by passing a Motion for the reduction of the Agent-General's salary. That Motion was rescinded the following day, but it was adopted with a view of calling attention to what was rightly considered to be a vicious practice in the hope that the authorities would see their way to remove it.

The Associated Chambers of Commerce in South Africa have convened a meeting for next week at Johannesburg, and a resolution will be moved urging legislative action against the rebate system. The Johannesburg Chamber of Commerce and Trade passed a resolution praying the Government to introduce a clause in all trade contracts requiring the contractor to carry public freights at the same rate as Government freights. I omitted to state that when we saved £2 a ton in Rhodesia we stipulated in the contract that the shipowner should carry freight for the public at the reduced rate. I need not trouble your Lordships with the other resolutions in favour of getting rid of the rebate system. It is well known that the German Government, in return for subsidies, are able to make what regulations they please as to the rates charged to the ordinary public; and I maintain that His Majesty's Government, acting in co-operation with the Governments of Natal and Cape Colony, should have no difficulty whatever in bringing pressure to bear on the Conference Lines in such a way as to satisfy them that if they are to carry in the future any portion of the tonnage which the Government have under their control, they will have to abandon the present 10 per cent. rebate system, and carry for the public at the same rates as they are prepared to carry for His Majesty's Government.

I believe that it was owing to the action of the Crown Agents that one independent line of steamers was driven to America, to compete against British traders and manufacturers, by the cheap rate of 10s. per ton from New York to Cape ports, and that if His Majesty's Government, through the Crown Agents, had supported that independent line, the rates to South African ports would have been reduced, to the great advantage of British trade and our fellow-subjects in South Africa. I do not believe that the competing line which fought the Conference ring ever received any support from His Majesty's Government. It was, consequently, forced into the ring. You now have left one solitary independent line of steamers on the East Coast of Africa—the British India Steamship Company. The Mombasa trade, which averages 200 tons per month, is so small that in order to avoid the transit dues through the Suez Canal this company goes right round by the Cape. The first port it touches at is Delagoa Bay. The company have made frequent requests to be allowed to share in the Government freights to Delagoa Bay, but, so far as I know, they have never received an invitation to tender. A recommendation was made that the East Coast line of steamers should receive a subsidy from the State in order to enable it to carry on Imperial work. It is admitted, I believe, on both sides of the House that such a subsidy would be justified. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, however, pointed out the other day that, in view of the present state of national finance, it was impossible for the Treasury to consider the suggestion. If you are going to pay no subsidy to a line which is wanted for Imperial purposes, what are you going to do for it? I believe the British India Steamship Company would much prefer to have a fair chance of a portion of the Government freights to Delagoa Bay than receive a subsidy. Are the Crown Agents going to give this company a portion of their freight contracts? If that is not done, I warn your Lordships that through the action of the Crown Agents the only independent British line of steamers to Delagoa Bay and the East Coast will be driven to join the Conference ring.

There is another point to which I wish to draw the attention of your Lordships. I happened to be in Germany the other day, and I elicited information as to the practice which exists for bringing the German manufacturer into closer touch with the South African consumer. As your Lordships will admit, it is most desirable, in the interests of all concerned, that the British manufacturer and the South African consumer should be brought in close connection with each other. The Germans and Americans have established a system of through bookings, but through bookings are impossible in this country so long as the 10 per cent. rebate system is kept up. It is absolutely certain that unless we organise our transportation service with the same care that the Germans and Americans are organising theirs, we shall lose in the race of commerce to South Africa. The total value of exports (domestic and foreign) from New York to British South Africa was, for the year ended 30th June, 1901, £2,498,397; for the year ended 30th June, 1902, £3,044,648; and for the year ended 30th June, 1903, £4,732,517. It has practically doubled in two years. The largest increases have taken place in foodstuffs and manufactured articles in which Great Britain could successfully compete were it not for the excessive freight charges prevailing from this country. I conclude with a most earnest appeal that the Government will appoint an impartial Committee to make inquiry into the subjects which have been referred to, or, if for any reason that should be considered inadvisable, that they will at any rate follow the practice which has been adopted so successfully by the Indian Government, and place their freight contracts out to public tender.

*THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (The Duke of MARLBOROUGH): My Lords, your Lordsips have before you the Parliamentary Papers relating to the commercial business of the Crown Agents for the Colonies, but perhaps I may be allowed to supplement a few remarks on those Papers. As your Lordships are aware, there are some forty-four colonies and protectorates that buy their stores through the Crown Agents, and it requires no effort of imagination to see that if each had its own agent to buy in the London market they would in all probability bid against one another and thus raise the price of stores to the detriment of the colonies. Moreover, it is very doubtful whether, if each had its own agent, the colonies would have the advantage of the services of such men of experience, trained in commercial pursuits, which they now possess in the Crown Agency. We believe that the cost to the colonies would not only be increased, but the system would be altogether unworkable. The noble Earl who moved the Motion now before your Lordships admitted that the theory and principles of the Crown Agents' Office were sound. He admits that the system has to exist, and he did not suggest to your Lordships any other system which should be adopted in its place.

*THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH: I said that as regards this issue of loans and all other such purposes it might be advisable to retain them, but I was opposed to their acting as Government buyers. I object to monopoly of any kind.

*THE DUKE OF MARLBOROUGH: The view of the Government is that with so large a number of colonies, varying in size, in geographical, racial, and industrial conditions, it is essential to have an Agency with a general and uniform practice in commercial dealings, and with one set of rules and principles to guide it. Obstacles to anything like concerted action by the Colonies in the matter exists in their varying interest, and consequently we feel it is not unimportant, on Imperial grounds, that they should have a common business centre in London in the form of an Agency, just as they have for political and administrative questions a common central ground in the Colonial Office.

I would remind your Lordships what are the advantages of centralising the business of the Crown Colonies in the hands of the Crown Agents. In the first place, there is the advantage of concentrating the large and long experience derived from business of many colonies in one body of men. This body of men—this Agency—we believe can buy in the cheapest market. They possess a power of control over manufacturers which one single agent could not possibly exercise. If a manufacturer does not supply the proper quality of goods or otherwise fails in his contract, the Crown Agents possess authority and power over him which one single agent could not possess. There is also an advantage in connection with loans and the management of sinking funds, and we believe the Crown Agents to be a much better body of men to deal with the many financial matters involved. The noble Earl will notice, on page 8 of the Parliamentary Paper, that the Crown Agents give advice and assistance, pay the salaries of officers on leave, and carry out many minor matters which are of great assistance to the Colonies, and which they would have difficulty in getting done if a body like the Crown Agents did not exist.

These are, in rough outline, the functions of the Crown Agents. Let us consider for a moment the remuneration they receive. In the first place, they get 1 per cent. on all stores for railways and stores of a commercial character. The noble Earl who spoke first asked whether this 1 per cent. covered everything. My information is that the 1 per cent. is the sole and only charge in connection with any orders which the Crown Agents transact on behalf of the Colonies. The noble Earl was anxious to know whether there were also cash discounts and trade discounts. I am happy to inform him that both these considerations are laid down in the instructions of the Secretary of State to the Crown Agents. The noble Earl also asked whether the Crown Agents invited tenders for every order which was over £100 in value. I have a Parliamentary Paper here which has just been published in response to an inquiry in the House of Commons, which gives a list of the articles which the Crown Agents have invited tenders for, and the names of the different firms who have supplied the articles. In addition to this 1 per cent., the Crown Agents charge ½ per cent. on all loans, and ¼ per cent. on the payment of the interest on loans. From these receipts are defrayed the salaries of the three Crown Agents and the cost of the administration of the office; and if there is any money over at the end of the year it is transferred to the reserve fund, the income of which is employed for the purpose of granting pensions to the Crown Agents. The salaries are fixed by the Secretary of State. There can be no inducement, therefore, as the noble Earl inferred on the occasion of the last debate, for the Crown Agents to make their orders as large as possible with a view to increasing their percentage. The noble Earl certainly made that statement on the last occasion, and I understand from his remarks to-day that he does not in any way withdraw it. Let me, as carefully as I can, explain this system of percentage.

*THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH: I did not deal with the question of percentages at all. I asked the noble Duke about the question of commission, and whether the 1 per cent. included everything.

*THE DUKE OF MARLBOROUGH: The percentage which the Crown Agents get cannot in any way affect them, because their salaries are fixed and can only be altered by the sanction of the Secretary of State. Therefore, there cannot be any inducement for them to make their orders as large as possible so as to gain a greater percentage. As I have already stated, if there is any money over at the end of the year it is transferred to the reserve fund, the interest on which may be utilised, in addition to granting pensions, for the purpose of making good any loss that may occur in any year on the working of the office. Obviously, if the profits made by the Crown Agents were so considerable that the reserve fund increased to an unduly large degree, the Secretary of State would consider it his duty to reduce the scale of charges so as to make the profit and loss account balance as nearly as possible. The Colonies, in giving an order, state the price they wish to pay, and the Crown Agents are obliged to buy at that price, and are only permitted a small margin. It is, therefore, quite clear that the contention of the noble Earl that the Crown Agents, by the system of percentage, are deliberately encouraged to make large orders and buy in the dearest market is unjustified by the facts of the case. I confess it is very distasteful to me to have to allude to a subject of this sort at all, for, after all, we are dealing with a body of men of high character and long experience in the public service. It is only with the desire to show clearly to your Lordships that there can be no possible inducement for the Crown Agents to make their orders as large as possible with a view to increasing their remuneration that I have ventured to dwell on this matter at such length. I do not think I need say any more with regard to the position of the Crown Agents and the form of their remuneration. It is a system which those who are experienced in these matters consider the best that can be devised. But since the noble Earl seems to regard it with some disfavour and to think that the system is not quite perfect, I can assure him that if he can suggest any improvement on the present scheme, any point where he sees an improvement can be effected, the Secretary of State will bear the suggestion in mind. I do not think I need dwell on the personal reflections that the noble Earl made with regard to the Permanent Under-Secretary at the Colonial Office.

*THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH: Will the noble Duke prove that my facts are wrong?

*THE DUKE OF MARLBOROUGH: I do not propose to go into that discussion to-night, beyond saying that I do not think the noble Earl's reflections upon the Permanent Under-Secretary are altogether according to the best traditions of your Lordships' House. As to the question whether the system of the Crown Agents is sound or successful, I would point out that the late Colonial Secretary held an exhaustive inquiry into the subject. He wrote a dispatch to all the Governors inquiring their views on the system, and also inviting them to state any complaints they might have. I would impress upon your Lordships that this inquiry was not a perfunctory inquiry where only a pious expression of opinion was asked, but a searching and exhaustive inquiry, organised with the deliberate aim in view of ascertaining whether there was any cause of complaint against the Crown Agents' system. I think your Lordships will admit that this was a pretty severe trial for any administrative office to be subjected to. In this matter, as in all others, the late Colonial Secretary was most business-like, and the inquiry instituted by him was carried out in the most searching and business-like manner.

Replies from the Governors were duly received. A minority of them replied that they were perfectly satisfied with the system, and had no cause of complaint whatever. A majority of the Governors did say they had cause of complaint. At the same time, they said, in the most definite terms, that they were perfectly satisfied with the quality of the goods supplied by the Crown Agents, and also with the prices charged. Their chief complaint was directed to the delay in carrying out their orders. This delay was accounted for by the fact that orders to the Crown Agents had formerly to be referred to the Colonial Office for sanction. If your Lordships will turn to page 4 of the Parliamentary Paper, you will see that by Sections 5 and 7 this difficulty has been now removed. When once the Secretary of State has passed the Budget of a colony for the year, the colony is entitled to ask the Crown Agents to supply all the items specified without further reference to the Colonial Office. Another reason for the delay was the fact that manufacturers failed to carry out their bargains. I am sure your Lordships must have had personal experience of how difficult it is to induce manufacturers to carry out their bargains to time; and in the case of the Crown Agents, who had an enormous number of contracts to make, it is not surprising that there were many instances when they could not force the manufacturers to deliver goods at the exact date agreed upon. The penalty clause may be enforced, but the only result is that the manufacturer, the next time he tenders, includes in his tender the amount of the penalty he is likely to incur. The result of the replies of the Colonial Governors is well summed up in the second paragraph of the Secretary of State's dispatch contained in the Parliamentary Paper now before your Lordships. What does the Secretary of State say? He states that—

> "After a most careful consideration of the answers to his dispatch, my predecessor placed on record his opinion that the number of complaints was small in proportion to the number of the Colonies which had sent replies; that few of the complaints were serious; that, allowing for the percentage of mistakes for which allowance in all businesses must be made, and taking into consideration the very small charge for agency which the Colonies have to pay, the existing system had, beyond question, worked well for the Colonies; and that Crown Agents had deserved the confidence alike of the Governments of the Crown Colonies and of successive Secretaries of State."

It is very easy to make complaints, but very often when inquired into there is frequently forthcoming a complete answer to show that the complaint is not in any way justified. On the last occasion that we debated this subject the noble Earl who has moved the Resolution now before the House complained of the cost of the Gold Coast Railway, and he has alluded to that railway again this afternoon. He said on the last occasion—

> "The Crown Agents undertook the building of the Ashantee Railway. The estimated cost of that railway was £8,000 a mile, but the actual cost was £13,000 a mile."

*THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH: I stated in the course of my speech to-day that the cost was £10,300 a mile.

*THE DUKE OF MARLBOROUGH: I am alluding to the figures which the noble Earl gave on the last occasion. I am quite aware that he has come down in his figures to-day.

*THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH: I am not aware of having stated the higher figure.

*THE DUKE OF MARLBOROUGH: I am quoting from the report of the noble Earl's speech which appears in *The Parliamentary Debates*. The exact cost of the construction of the Gold Coast Railway was £10,300 per mile.

*THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH: That is what I stated.

*THE DUKE OF MARLBOROUGH: The noble Earl went on to say that this railway was very extravagantly built, and compared very unfavourably with other railways in Africa. Now the Congo Railway—with a 2ft. 6in. gauge—cost £10,400 a mile; the Cape Government Railway—which has the same gauge as the Gold Coast Railway, 3ft. 6in.—cost £10,524 a mile; the Natal Railway, with the same gauge as the Gold Coast, cost £13,771 a mile. The cost of these Railways was higher than that of the Gold Coast Railway. The noble Earl, in the course of his speech on the last occasion, said that—

> "Mr. Pauling, a well-known South African contractor, has built railways in tropical portions of Portuguese South East Africa, where the climatic and physical conditions are of the same character as obtained in the case of the Ashantee Railway. He built the railway from Beira to Mashonaland, as well as railways in Rhodesia, and the average cost of the railways he constructed has been £5,000 a mile."

Well, my Lords, I have been at pains to find out the exact cost of the Beira-Mashonaland Railway, and it works ou at £10,250 a mile, within £50 of the cost of the Gold Coast Railway. Yet the noble Earl who spoke last said the Gold Coast Railway was the most glaring instance of extravagant railway construction he knew of.

*EARL GREY: A railway built with the credit of the Imperial Government and a railway built with the money found by a commercial company are two very different things. The Beira-Mashonaland Railway Company had to construct the line from hand to mouth and borrow money on extravagant terms.

*THE DUKE OF MARLBOROUGH: I am not concerned to know how the money was raised. There is a still more remarkable instance of the inaccuracy of the statements noble Lords make with regard to the practice of the Crown Agents. Your Lordships will remember that on the last occasion that this subject was discussed the noble Earl (Earl Grey) strongly condemned the present system, and quoted the case of the purchase of a steamer for Lake Nyassa by Sir Harry Johnston. The noble Earl said—

> "Some years ago Sir Harry Johnston, when he was Commissioner of the British Central African Protectorate, requisitioned for a steamer for Lake Nyassa. He drew out the specification and obtained a private tender from a firm of contractors. The Office of the Crown Agents thought that in obtaining this tender Sir Harry Johnston was encroaching upon their province. They made representations to the Colonial Office that the business of supplying the steamer belonged to their Department, and they insisted on supplying the steamer themselves. Sir Harry Johnston by acting individually was able to obtain a tender to supply that steamer at £8,000. The steamer offered by the Crown Agents was to have cost £13,000. The noble Duke is acquainted with the character of Sir Harry Johnston. He was most indignant at his Administration being asked to spend £5,000 more than he thought necessary. He went straight to the Prime Minister, and Lord Salisbury decided that in this case there was a reason for departing from the usual custom of the Government; he took the ordering of the steamer out of the hands of the Crown Agents and handed it over to Sir Harry Johnston. The steamer was built for £8,000."

Now, what are the real facts of this case? Sir Harry Johnston sent home a specification and plans of the steamer, suggesting that they—

> "Might be placed in the hands of the Crown Agents so that tenders might be invited."

That is what the noble Earl described as the Crown Agents insisting on supplying the steamer themselves. The specification was sent to the Crown Agents, who informed the Foreign Office that the ship would cost £12,500. The Foreign Office replied that the Superintendent of Marine of the protectorate had been authorised to negotiate privately with shipbuilding firms to see whether a lower estimate could be obtained. The superintendent at once departed from the original specification which he had himself drawn up. The speed was reduced from 13 to 11 knots; the double bottom on cellular system was omitted, together with an expensive system for pumping out the various departments; the thickness of the plating was reduced by 33 per cent; the limit of weight of packages was increased from 200 to 300 lbs. with the effect of greatly reducing the amount of riveting, planing, and other work. The limit of 200 lbs. was originally fixed by Sir Harry Johnston on the ground that, as the vessel had to be erected locally, she should be sent out in pieces suitable for transport on men's heads. Innumerable other alterations were made, such as a large reduction in accommodation, wooden masts instead of steel, and two boats were ordered instead of four. In fact, it was a totally different vessel from the one originally requisitioned, and there is not the slightest ground for supposing that the Crown Agents could not, if they had had the opportunity, have obtained tenders for the construction of this vessel as low as that obtained by the superintendent.

I do not for a moment impute to my noble friend a desire to be other than perfectly accurate, but I have no doubt he has fallen into error by believing a statement made to him. It may be that Sir Harry Johnston himself gave him the information, but in these matters Sir Harry Johnston—I wish to use a Parliamentary term—is not quite to be relied upon. Speaking on 22nd March this year, at a meeting of the Society of Arts, Sir Harry Johnston enlarged upon the iniquities of the Crown Agents in a somewhat similar strain to that of the noble Earl. He said—

> "People were sent out, not because they were absolutely suited for the work and would be chosen by a hard-headed business firm, but

because they were people whom somebody wanted to provide for."

That was what Sir Harry Johnston said a few months ago. I will now read to your Lordships an extract from a letter which he wrote to the Crown Agents from Nakuro, Uganda Protectorate, dated 18th February, 1901, when he held a very different view. Quite gratuitously, and without being asked, Sir Harry Johnston wrote the following letter to the Crown Agents—

> "I should like in connection with this matter to thank you for the trouble you have taken during the last year in selecting those employees of the Administration with whose appointments you are more especially charged. No one whom you have sent out to fill the post of engineer, blacksmith, printer, dispenser, or unqualified hospital assistant has proved other than satisfactory. This care in selection has so materially assisted my work, and has made my relations with these men so agreeable, that I feel it is only due to you to make this communication."

I would not have ventured to remind your Lordships of these facts at such great length except as a form of protest against the line of reasoning so commonly adopted. The form of reasoning employed is to find an isolated case where the Crown Agents are supposed to be at fault, and, without waiting to see whether the case can be explained, base upon it a sweeping indictment against the whole system and a declaration that the Crown Agents do not deserve the confidence of your Lordships, and that there is widespread dissatisfaction with the manner in which they conduct their business.

With regard to the suggestion that the people of the Transvaal should be allowed to tender for Government requirements, it is obviously much cheaper to buy under the system which the Government have adopted. Assume that a Johannesburg order for machinery is placed with a merchant in England. The merchant purchases the machinery from the manufacturer, and pays the manufacturer when the machinery is shipped from England. He himself does not receive payment until the machinery is erected at Johannesburg. He thus stands out of the use of the capital involved in the order and of the amount of the freight from England to Johannesburg for the period between the date on which the machinery leaves England and the date on which it is erected at Johannesburg. He must, therefore, obviously include in the cost of the order, not only a charge to cover his office expenses, but also a charge to cover the loss of interest on the cost of the order and the cost of freight for the period named. The rate of such interest will be, say, 4 per cent. Now, suppose the same order were given to a merchant in Johannesburg. He would similarly buy from the manufacturer in England and pay when the machinery was shipped from England, but would have to stand out of the money so paid and the amount of the freight for the period of the machinery's journey from England to Johannesburg. But in his case the rate of interest on the capital which he would have to cover in the price would be at South African rates, that is, about 8 per cent., instead of 4 per cent., and his office expenses, owing to the high rates and the high cost of living in South Africa, would be at least two or three times those of a merchant living in England. It is clear, therefore, that the Johannesburg merchant would either have to charge a higher price for the same machinery, or, charging the same price, supply an inferior article.

The noble Earl who spoke last referred to the subject of freights. My noble friend the Earl of Onslow will deal with that question later. I believe the Crown Agents have, on behalf of the Colonial Office, made as good terms for the shipment of freight from this country to South Africa as any other body of agents could have done. It is the view of the Secretary of State that there are no sufficient grounds for granting a Committee of Inquiry into the system adopted by the Crown Agents. The view of His Majesty's Government is that the Crown Agents' system is a good one, no better system having been devised; that they do their work in an efficient manner; that the system of remuneration is a reasonable system; and that the criticism of the method of payment is unwarranted. Moreover, a searching and exhaustive inquiry has been made into the administration of the Crown Agents' Office; the complaints that were brought forward were thoroughly dealt with, and the Crown Agents vindicated. Consequently, it is the view of His Majesty's Government that there are not sufficient reasons to justify a further inquiry into their administration. But the Secretary of

State has desired me to say that he is willing to meet any specific charge that can be brought forward against the efficiency of the Crown Agents' administration either in your Lordships' House or by communication to the Colonial Office, and he will be most willing to publish the result of the inquiry. If, however, the complaints are similar in character to those brought forward in your Lordships' House, there will be no difficulty in disposing of them. In conclusion, I would beg your Lordships to remember, as you can see from the Papers before you, that both Mr. Chamberlain, who had the closest and most intimate knowledge of the work of the Crown Agents' Office during a period of eight or more years, and Mr. Lyttelton, the present Secretary of State, bear testimony to the successful manner in which the Crown Agents have conducted their business; and it is our view that they deserve the confidence, not only of the colonies whose business they transact, but we hope also of the majority of the Members of your Lordships' House.

*THE MARQUESS OF RIPON: My Lords, I am sorry to learn from the speech of the noble Duke that it is the intention of His Majesty's Government to refuse the appointment of this Committee. I am especially sorry to learn it in the interests of the Crown Agents themselves. I was for some years associated with them at the Colonial Office, and I desire to speak of them and their administration with confidence and respect. I agree with the view expressed in the dispatch from Mr. Lyttelton as to the administration of these public officers, and I can assure your Lordships that nothing is further from my intention, in supporting the appointment of this Committee of Inquiry, than to do it in a spirit which would be calculated to cast the slightest reflection upon the methods pursued by the Crown Agents. I heard with regret the insinuations which seemed to be directed against Sir Montague Ommanney. I have known Sir Montague for some years. He was at the head of the Crown Agents at the time I was at the Colonial Office. I had for him a perfect respect. I believe him to be a capable public officer and a very honourable man, and I should not be doing my duty to him or to the public if I did not, having served with him so long, give expression to that opinion. It is clear that that view was also entertained by the late Colonial Secretary, for Mr. Chamberlain promoted Sir Montague Ommanney from the position of First Crown Agent to the important position of Permanent Under-Secretary; and I understand from the speech of the noble Duke that Sir Montague has in no way forfeited the good opinion which I and my successor entertained of him.

But, my Lords, when I consider the nature of the criticism which has been made of the conduct of the Crown Agents, both by my noble friend Lord Portsmouth and by the noble Earl below the Gangway, I do think that it is very desirable indeed that there should be an impartial inquiry such as could be conducted by a Committee of this House. It is desirable for the purpose of affording to the Crown Agents the fullest opportunity of meeting any criticisms that may be made against them. What have we seen to-night? The noble Duke's speech was really mainly directed, not to answering the speeches which have been made this evening, but to answering speeches which were made some months ago. I do not in the least complain of the noble Duke in that matter. He could not, of course, tell what were the points likely to be brought forward, and in a complicated matter of this kind no one could be surprised that he was not able to give a detailed answer to the charges. He made what I think was a powerful reply to the charges which were brought forward earlier in the session. But we cannot go on in that way. My noble friend behind me will probably in about a fortnight reply to the noble Duke's speech to-day, and then the noble Duke after a month will reply to the speech of my noble friend; but that is not the way to deal with a matter of this kind. These criticisms are grave; there is no shirking the matter; they are grave, and are intended by those who bring them forward to be grave, and I venture to submit that it is only just to the Crown Agents that they should have the fullest opportunity of stating their views and of explaining their conduct before an impartial body.

From what I have seen of the administration of the Crown Agents I should expect that they would clear away a great deal of what has been said against them. There may be points in which they have committed errors, but my own expectation would be that they would come, on the whole, broadly speaking, scathless out of such an inquiry. But an inquiry I hold is due to them, and it is due to the public. It is not right that charges of this kind should be made against public officers and should not be fully inquired into. The noble Duke's invitation to noble Lords who have brought forward this matter to send him letters and ask him to inquire into specific charges is of no use in a case in which charges have been publicly made. If my noble friend had thought fit to bring this matter before the Colonial Office before calling attention to it here that would be another matter. If the statements are true, they show an urgent necessity for a change in the administration of the Crown Agents' Office; if they are founded on misrepresentations, then the sooner those misrepresentations are cleared away the better. Therefore, I do very earnestly hope that the Government will reconsider their determination not to allow this inquiry.

No inquiry within the Office itself will satisfy the public mind. No doubt there are a great many people in the country accustomed to deal with these questions who do criticise and always have criticised certain proceedings of the Crown Agents. Well, let those matters be brought to the test of an impartial inquiry such as your Lordships will give them, and then the reputation and the administrative character of the Crown Agents will be cleared and the matter put on a satisfactory footing. I myself, I confess, rather regret that my noble friend Lord Portsmouth did not make his Motion somewhat wider. I am sorry that it is so closely confined to the action of the Crown Agents as individuals. I am bound to confess that nine years ago when I left the Colonial Office I had no intention of revising the system; but in these days, when methods of conducting commercial and industrial business change so rapidly, when new methods are being introduced in one way and another so frequently, I can quite believe that there might be improvements made in the general system of this portion of colonial administration. I therefore think it would be desirable if the Committee were enabled to go fully into the whole question of the constitution of the Office and the duties entrusted to the Crown Agents. As your Lordships know, the Crown Agents deal only with Crown colonies. I think the noble Duke was rather knocking down something which had not been set up when he said it would never do to have a system by which every one of the forty Crown Colonies was represented by a separate agent in London. I do not think that was suggested at all, but I agree with the noble Duke that it would be a very absurd system. The Crown Agents have nothing to do with self-governing colonies.

I confess there was one portion of the speech of the noble Duke which made me smile, and that was the part which related to the Transvaal. We have been told over and over again that it is intended to treat that Crown colony as a self-governing colony, and it is rather surprising to find that while upon questions involving great matters of Imperial importance the Government are prepared to leave the decision in the hands of the Government of the Transvaal, yet when it comes to a question of how the stores for the Transvaal are to be bought they will not listen for a moment to the suggestion to treat the Transvaal as a self-governing colony. On the contrary, in spite of the protests of those in the Transvaal to whom upon all other matters they are inclined to bow, they determine upon this point—and if ever there was a matter which should be left to the decision of a local Legislature it is one of this kind—that they will adhere to the system of purchasing the stores through the Crown Agents. That seems to be an exceedingly unintelligible and inconsistent proceeding. If you mean to regard the Transvaal as a self-governing colony and to treat the nominated Legislature of the Transvaal as a representative Legislature, surely if there is one thing more than another which you might leave to be judged by them it is this question of the purchase of stores. I know how utterly impossible it is to maintain in practice the absurd theory which it seems to me His Majesty's Government have adopted of treating a Crown colony in any respect as if it were a self-governing colony. I feel bound to record my vote for the Motion before the House.

but I shall do it more particularly because I desire the utmost vindication of the character of the Crown Agents, and because I believe that before such a Committee as we are asking for that object would be achieved.

*THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES (The Earl of ONSLOW): My Lords, I shall not detain your Lordships for more than a few minutes, but I must express the satisfaction with which I heard the remarks that have just fallen from the noble Marquess in regard to Sir Montague Ommanney. We are proud of our Civil Service. We believe it to be above suspicion, and it is not often in this House that we hear any suggestion that it is otherwise. I am prepared to agree with the noble Marquess that if there were any grounds for this inquiry it would be in the interests of the Crown Agents that it should take place. I do not think the Crown Agents have any reason to fear any inquiry into their system or their methods of business, but they have not asked the Secretary of State to allow this inquiry to take place. If they had, I do not know that he could have refused it; but your Lordships must remember that business of this kind is of a somewhat ticklish character. There is such a thing as trade jealousy, and I am not at all sure that it would be in the interests of the State that the exact manner in which the business of the Crown Agents is done should be made public, and that they should be subjected to cross-examination by those who are, after all, in competition with them.

Have the charges that have been made been against the Crown Agents? The noble Earl who moved the Motion now before the House talked at great length about the action of the Government of Ceylon, but that action was taken by the Colonial Government, and had nothing whatever to do with the Crown Agents. The noble Marquess said he thought that when these charges are brought they ought to be thoroughly sifted by an impartial Committee, but we have had some experience of the nature of these charges. If the complaints are as flimsy and as easily dispelled as those that have been previously brought forward, I say that much the cheapest, safest, and easiest way is for noble Lords to bring those charges individually before the attention of the Colonial Office. We have the assurance that the Secretary of State will give them every consideration. There was one point that the noble Earl opposite did not quite comprehend. He asked, Do you not pay commissions, and, if you do, who do you pay them to, and who pays them? Commissions are paid, but the whole of those commissions cost the Colonies no more than the 1 per cent on the price of the stores. The 1 per cent. covers everything. The noble Marquess said that if we were going to treat the Transvaal as if it were a colony with a responsible Government in every way, surely this was one of the things in regard to which we could so treat it. We have had no representation yet from the Government of the Transvaal. We should like them to consider whether or not, if they order from a firm in the Transvaal, who, of course, would have to buy in England, they would have to pay an increased price, and if they are satisfied that it would be better for them to pay a heavier commission than they pay under the present system; that is a matter which the Secretary of State would take into consideration.

I now come to what fell from the noble Earl below the Gangway (Earl Grey) on the question of freights. The noble Earl has always been a great champion of public tender. The noble Earl's view prevailed with the late Secretary of State for the Colonies, and tenders were invited for 60,000 tons of freights in the year 1904, but only one tender was received, and that tender was not in accordance with the terms of contract.

*EARL GREY: I am not surprised, considering the conditions attached to the contract.

*THE EARL OF ONSLOW: I am not going to weary your Lordships at this late hour with the conditions contained in the contract.

*EARL GREY: That is the essence of the matter.

*THE EARL OF ONSLOW: The real reason they did not tender was that the Government refused to give the whole of their business either to the Conference Lines or to their rival. What then happened was that the seventh line was taken into the Conference by the other six, and the consequence is that we have no one carrying to South Africa to whom we can go for competition in the freight market. We should be only too glad to put our freights up to tender, but we know these is no company who will tender for those freights outside the Conference. A business arrangement exists between the British India Steamship Company and the Conference Lines. We have offered to give the British India Company an opportunity of tendering for Government freights if they will undertake to carry them to any of the South African ports. They pass Capetown, Natal, and Durban, but by an arrangement they have with the Conference Lines they are precluded from landing freight at any other place than Delagoa Bay. We cannot in consequence employ them. His Majesty's Government have the greatest desire to get the lowest possible freight to South Africa, and, short of bringing in a Bill, which I do not think the noble Earl has suggested, to prevent combination among shipowners—a practice which is adopted by every steamship line—I do not see what the Government can do more than they have done in the matter.

*Earl GREY: Simply follow the example of the Government of India.

*The Earl of ONSLOW: The Government of India have a number of steamships companies to whom to offer their contracts who are not in the Conference ring, and we have not. I hope your Lordships will not insist on the Motion which the noble Earl has submitted but be satisfied with the fact that the late Secretary of State asked the Governors of every colony which deals with the Crown Agents whether they had any complaints to make, and went fully into the complaints received. He satisfied himself that the cases merely showed that there was sometimes delay, and those mistakes common to human nature, and he recorded his opinion, which has been endorsed by the present Secretary of State, that on the whole the Colonies were satisfied with the Crown Agents, and that it would be unwise in the interests of the Empire to depart from a system which had prevailed for so many years.

On Question, resolved in the negative.

The Earl of Onslow.

THE YEOMANRY.

The Marquess of WINCHESTER asked the Under-Secretary for War for a Return of the number of Yeomanry regiments which assembled for their annual training between 18th May and 4th June inclusive, and the number of officers and men receiving the £5 horse allowance.

The UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (The Earl of Donoughmore): Our Returns are not yet complete, but I can inform the noble Marquess that the number of regiments out for training between the dates he mentions was twenty in all; seven commenced and finished their training within the dates mentioned, and thirteen assembled within those dates but did not complete before 4th June. As to the number of men and officers receiving the £5 horse allowance, I am afraid I cannot at present give any answer, but I shall be glad to do so the moment we get our Returns in. There were 11,381 horses returned last year as being the personal property either of the Yeomen themselves or of some members of their families; 562 were Government horses, leaving 10,666 which were classified as hired, but a great many of which would be individual horses, owing to the fact that a number of the regiments trained at the same time.

House adjourned at ten minutes past Seven o'clock, to Monday next, a quarter before Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 10th June, 1904.

The House met at Twelve of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS (STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE THERETO COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. Speaker laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz.:—Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Provisional Order Bill. Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time upon Monday next.

St. Marylebone Electric Lighting Bill. Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Swindon Corporation Bill. Reported, with Amendments, from the Police and Sanitary Committee [Section B]; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 14) Bill. Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time upon Monday next.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 15) Bill. Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time upon Monday next.

Education Board Provisional Order (Swansea) Bill. Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Order confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time upon Monday next.

Marylebone Chapels (St. James, Westmoreland Street) Bill [Lords]; South Staffordshire Mines Drainage Bill [Lords]. Reported, without Amendment; Reports to lie upon the Table.

Bills to be read the third time.

St Bartholomew's Hospital Bill [Lords]. Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table.

Public Accounts Committee. Second Report brought up, and read; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 207.]

Leyton Urban District Council Bill. Reported, with Amendments, from the Police and Sanitary Committee [Section A]; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Stirling and Dunblane, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES, ETC., BILL.

Petition from Barrow in Furness, against; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions against; from Old Town; Cragg; Heptonstall; Hebden Bridge; Glasgow; Sheffield (four); Darlington; Salford (two); Batley; Kilmarnock; North Ormesby; Leeds (thirteen); Armley (three); North Cowton; Christchurch; Kelloe; Charlestown; Foleshill; Bolton (two); Macclesfield: Dewsbury; St. Pancras Borough Council; Cheetwood (two); Runcorn; Davenham; Barnton; Northwich (four); Plumbley; Sproston; Goostrey; Church Hulme; Weaverham; Over; Hartford; Comberbach; Winsford (two); Acton; Middlewich; Great Budworth; Bartington; Sandiway; Norley; Pickmere; Wharton Works; Little Budworth; Lostock Graham; Kensal New Town; Paddington (three); Queen's Park; West London (three); Harrow Road; Catherine's Park; Leinster Square; St. John's Wood; North Mundham; Woodbridge; Ventnor; Cubbington; Huntspill; Highbridge; Coulting; Westonzoyland; Bridgwater; Spaxton; Combwich; Middlezoy; Lower Boddington; Crosshill; Woodford Green; Paddock Wood; West Wiltshire; Grenoside; Harbury; Burbage; Laddingford; Worsthorne; Haverton Hill; Burnley; Openshaw; Ollerton; Bedminster; Chacombe; Conway; Williamscott; Mobberley; Peterhead; Manchester (two); Perth; Thirsk and Sowerby; Orrell; Mereclough; Clitheroe; Pembroke; Holbeck (two); Bloxham; East Peckham; Stoke Newington; Sapcote; Cheshire; Alderley Edge; Pontefract; Goose Green; Dalston; Leamington (two); Wakefield (three); Cropredy; Knutsford; Alverthorpe; Garaton; Middleton; Festiniog (three); Bradford (two); Withington; Kenilworth; Bath; Perry Barr; Clutton; Beeston Hill; Wortley; Bramley; Putney; Hanley; Bristol (three); Llaintainam; Plymouth; Pwllheli; Aberdaron; Snelson; Adderbury; Pentre Halkin; Brenchley;

Chiddingstone Hoath; Greenfield; Walthamstow (three); Hedon; Great Bentley; Regent's Park; Buckley; Lowdham; Lloc; Edgworth; Llanelly; Bishopteignton; High Brooms; Teignmouth; Empingham; Shaldon; Widcombe; Dawlish; Gateshead; Flint (two); Pendreg; Red Hill; Rawtenstall; Buckland; South Hants; Portsmouth; Mold; Leeswood; Great Clacton; Newcastle-on-Tyne; Kempston; Cleethorpes; Bedford; New Wortley; Tonbridge; Trawsfynydd; Earlestown (two); Tunbridge Wells; Droylsden (three); Islington; Rhiw; Hooley Hill; Dean; Crowborough; Helmshone; Barwell; Hinckley; Swannington; Plumpton; East Holywell; West Ealing (two); Ealing (two); Dunham Hill; Bulwell; Nottingham; Stromness; Christleton; Cardiff (six); Derby; Halifax (two); Llainlar; Woburn Green; Ovenden; Wheatley; Illingworth; Akroyden; Middlesbrough (five); Penygarnedd; Marlow; Kidsgrove; Billy Row; Breedon-on-the-Hill; Leighton Buzzard; Grays; Keswick; Melksham; Halton; Silverdale; Sittingbourne; Whitwick; Bredgar; Fenny Stratford; Queensbury; Hawkhurst; Cosely; Bradshawgate; Willington; Coalville; Rhydfelen; Bilston; Penrith; Devizes; Thringstone; Berriew; Holland Park Avenue; Southwark; Fletchertown; Llanfyllin; Nantfyllon; Llansantfraid; Brithdir; Stargate; Woodsetton; Tipton; Crawcrook; Stoke-upon-Trent; Harpenden (three); Finchley; Gorton; Huby; Stony Stratford; Crumpsall; Southport (four); Clayton West; Leicester; Wing; Thorpe Fen Dykes; Walworth; West Hartlepool (nineteen); Redland; Ludham; Openshaw (two); Tottenham; High Spen; Govanhill; Pollokshields; Skegness; Selly Oak; Meagar; Wainfleet; Bradford; Newton Heath (two); Alderley Edge; Lichfield; Bradfield; Acle; Fleggburgh; West Caister; Friskney; Stow Hill; Lincoln (three); and Longsight; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions for alteration; from Bedminster Down; Kettering; Enfield (two); Bedford; Chiswick; Clifton; Tottenham; Cotham; and Winchester; to lie upon the Table.

PORT OF LONDON BILL.

Petition from Wandsworth, against; to lie upon the Table.

VALUATION BILL.

Petitions against; from Bridlington; and City of London; to lie upon the Table.

VALUATION BILL.

Petitions for alteration; from Maidstone; Carlisle; and Eccleshall; to lie upon the Table.

VALUATION BILL.

Petition from Liverpool, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

EAST INDIA (NATURAL FERTILISERS).

Return [presented 9th June] to be printed. [No. 206.]

SOUTH AFRICAN MINES (MORTALITY).

Return presented, relative thereto [Address 24th February; *Mr. Trevelyan*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 205.]

DUBLIN HOSPITALS.

Copy presented, of forty-sixth Report of the Board of Superintendence, with Appendices, for the year 1903–4 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (MISCELLANEOUS SERIES).

Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Miscellaneous Series, No. 612 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3180 and 3181 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

MERCHANT SEAMEN'S FUND.

Account presented, of the Receipts and Expenditure under the Seamen's Fund Winding-up Act from 1st January to 31st December, 1903 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Payments for Elementary School Expenses.

SIR JAMES RANKIN (Herefordshire, Leominster): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether it is permissible for the local education authority to pay the salaries or other payments due to any elementary school by one payment made to the correspondent or headmaster of any school, and distributed by him to the proper recipients, without involving such correspondent or headmaster as an accounting officer to the auditor of the local education authority's accounts.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) I am advised that sums paid to a person for distribution in the way suggested in the Question would render that person an accounting officer whose accounts would be subject to audit. A simple form of account has, however, been suggested by my Department for use in cases where sums are paid for distribution to one of the managers of a school as correspondent, and relate only to salaries. If this is produced at the audit the personal attendance of the manager would not, I think, in ordinary circumstances be required.

Tibet Expedition and Dum-dum Bullets.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): To ask the Secretary of State for India whether the troops, or any of them, on active service in the invasion of Tibet are provided with the dum-dum bullet, originally manufactured for the British Army in India, or any other bullet of an explosive character; and, if so, what explanation, if any, can be offered for the use of such bullets in the Tibetan Expedition, having regard to the undertaking against their use in the Boer War and the declaration signed by all the delegates of the European Powers, except the delegates of Great Britain, at the Hague Conference to abstain from the use of bullets which expand or flatten easily in the human body, such as bullets with a hard envelope which does not entirely cover the body or is pierced with incisions.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) The Government of India have not informed me what ammunition is being used in Tibet, but I am making inquiry. No bullets used by the Indian Army or by the British Army in India are of an explosive character.

Sir Antony McDonnell's Salary.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG (Antrim, S.): To ask the Secretary of State for India what pay, if any, chargeable to the Revenues of India in respect of the year ending 31st March, 1904, has been received by Sir Antony Patrick McDonnell as salary or pension, or both; and what services has this official during this period rendered to the Indian Government.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) During the period in question Sir A. P. McDonnell has been in receipt of the Bengal civil annuity of £1,000 earned by his past services in India. He has received no salary as member of the Council of India, having been employed in another department of the public service.

Evictions on the Teenan Estate.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the receiver on the estate of Joseph Byrne, situate near Ballyshannon, commonly known as the Teenan Estate, obtained ejectment decrees against some forty tenants at the March quarter sessions for county Donegal, and that caretaker notices have since been served on those tenants, notwithstanding the fact that the great majority of them had paid a year's rent, and some two years rent, part harvest rent; that thirty-five civil bill decrees and six ejectment decrees have been obtained at the present quarter sessions against all the remaining tenants; and whether, having regard to the fact that the tenants were and are anxious to purchase their holdings, but are unable to do so owing to the circumstance that a portion of the proceedings were in another Court, whereof the receiver has been appointed by the Land Judge, what steps will be taken to enable the tenants to purchase their holdings, and, pending the purchase and so long as the current

rent is paid, to stay proceedings for their eviction and the destruction of their interest in their holdings.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) I am not aware that the statements in the first part of the Question are accurate. The Land Purchase Acts contain ample provisions enabling tenants to become proprietors of their holdings, and I cannot admit the accuracy of the statement that they are unable to purchase in the present instance. The Executive has no power to intervene in the manner suggested at the conclusion of the Question.

Irish District and County Council Officials and Political Meetings.

MR. EDWARD MITCHELL (Fermanagh, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether paid officials of district or county councils in Ireland may, without violation of the official regulations, take part in political meetings.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The Local Government Board is of opinion that officers of county and rural district councils should refrain from publicly identifying themselves with any political Party. The Board has always advised officials to this effect whenever its opinion has been sought.

The Cape Parliament—Chinese Exclusion Bill.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the Governor of Cape Colony, in reserving his assent to the Chinese Exclusion Bill, passed by both Houses of the Cape Parliament for the consideration of the Crown, while that assent was given to all the other measures passed by the Cape Parliament during its session, acted on his own initiative or at the suggestion of Lord Milner or the Colonial Office; and when will the temporary bar to the Chinese Exclusion Bill becoming law in Cape Colony be removed.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Lyttelton.*) The Governor reserved his assent to the Bill because, as he intimates, it appeared to him to be one of a class his assent to which he is bound to withhold by the Royal Instructions issued to Governors of the Colony. The Bill as passed has not yet been submitted to me by the Governor, and I am not, therefore, as yet in a position to advise His Majesty upon it.

The Governor-General of India.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: To ask the First Lord of the Treasury who is now Governor-General of India, having regard to the statutory provisions by which it is enacted that a Governor-General of India vacates that office by absence from India.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) Under Section 50 of the Indian Councils Acts, 1861, Lord Ampthill, being the senior of the two Governors of Madras and Bombay, has become acting Governor-General, and will hold the office of Governor-General, with the emoluments, until some other person shall be appointed to it, and shall have arrived in India.

MUSICAL COPYRIGHT BILL.

As amended (by the Standing Committee), considered.

MR. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid.) said he did not intend to move the first clause standing in his name, but the second which repealed the Act of 1902, so that everything might be in the one Bill and it would not be necessary to refer to other Acts.

*MR. MOUNT (Berkshire, Newbury) said if he might interrupt the hon. Member for Mid. Lanark at this point he would say the promoters were prepared to accept the first Amendment on the Paper and also the next two. They would have preferred to have a consolidation Bill, but as the hon. Member had put down these new clauses they were prepared to accept them.

MR. CALDWELL said if he understood from the observations made by the hon. Gentleman representing the promoters of the Bill that it was the *bona-fide* intention to carry out the clause he was quite prepared to move it, but it must be on the condition that advantage must not be taken of any proposal in the House of Commons to make an alteration in another place.

*MR. MOUNT said he could not say, of course, or make any promise, as to what would happen in another place, but he should accept this clause as consolidating the two Bills; that was the intention of the promoters.

MR. CALDWELL said if this was a mere subterfuge on the part of the promoters——

*MR. SPEAKER pointed out that the hon. Member had said as plainly as he could that it was the *bona-fide* intention of the promoters to regard this as the consolidation of the two Bills.

MR. CALDWELL: That having been stated in the House, I beg to move the new clause.

A clause (Seizure of pirated copies).

"It shall be lawful for any police constable, on the request in writing of the owner of the copyright, or of his agent thereto authorised in writing, and on production to such constable of a copy of the entry of such copyright in the book of registry, certified and impressed as aforesaid, and at the risk of such owner, to seize without warrant any pirated copies of such musical work which, within view of such constable, and in any public place or place to which the public have access on payment or otherwise, are being hawked or carried about for purposes constituting an offence under this Act, and to bring the same before a Court of summary jurisdiction for the purpose of its being determined in accordance with the provisions hereinbefore contained, whether the same are or are not liable to forfeiture and destruction."—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Brought up, and read the first and second time, and added.

MR. CALDWELL: The next is consequential, as is also the third.

Another clause (Repeal of Act).

"The Musical (Summary Proceedings) Copyright Act, 1902, is hereby repealed."—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Brought up, and read the first and second time, and added.

Another clause (Definitions).

"'Musical copyright' means the exclusive right of the owner of such copyright, under the Copyright Acts in force for the time being, to do or to authorise another person to do all or any of the following things of a musical work:—

"(1) To make copies, by writing or otherwise, of such musical work;

"(2) To abridge such musical work;

"(3) To make any new adaptation, arrangement, or setting of such musical work, or of the melody thereof, in any notation or system.

"'Musical work' means any combination of melody and harmony, or either of them, printed, reduced to writing, or otherwise graphically produced or reproduced.

"'Pirated musical work' means any musical work written, printed, or otherwise reproduced, without the consent lawfully given by the owner of the copyright in such musical work.

"The expression 'plates' includes any stereotype or other plates, stones, or matrixes or negatives used for the purpose of printing or reproducing copies of any pirated musical work."—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Brought up, and read the first and second time, and added.

MR. CALDWELL said the next clause he proposed to move was the limitation of the Act. There could be no doubt as to the necessity of this.

Another clause (Limitation of Act).

"This Act shall not apply to any musical copyright which is not registered in terms of The Copyright Act, 1842, and no proceedings shall be competent in respect of any offence committed prior to such registration."—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Brought up, and read the first and second time, and added.

MR. HUMPHREYS-OWEN (Montgomeryshire) said the clause which he asked the House to insert could, he thought, be inserted without demur on the part of the promoters. It was calculated to encourage the practice of music, and was a concession which could be granted without serious difficulty to the publishers.

*MR. SPEAKER said the hon. Member would not be in order in moving the clause, which seemed to be to create a new obligation in the law of copyright, and not to be relevant to the purpose of the Bill.

MR. HUMPHREYS-OWEN said on the point of order he submitted that the clause was somewhat germane to the purpose of the Bill which should condition the form on which copyright should be given. He submitted that although the clause was very near the boundary line it did not go over the boundary.

***MR. SPEAKER** said he thought it was more than near the boundary, it was over the boundary, and would not be in order.

MR. CALDWELL said the next Amendment opened a very important question. Under the present law a copyright might be held without registration, and this clause made it necessary that before action was taken the copyright must be registered. The registration of copyright ought to be compulsory for the reason that if it was not people could not tell what was copyright and what was not. The whole state of the law was in a very flimsy condition so far as copyright was concerned. A copyright was not, as many supposed, something in the nature of a patent, something which was a title in law, and when they were creating penal offences registration should be made compulsory, because a man should know before an offence was committed exactly what was copyright and what was not. There was no compulsion at the present time; a man waited till an offence was committed because by so doing he saved the 5s. registration fee. In view of the great value of these copyrights, running as it did into hundreds of thousands of pounds, surely the least thing the owners could do was to register them within one month of the first publication. If a man delayed registration, the difficulty was increased in connection with prosecutions. Let them begin at the very foundation, so as to facilitate the task of tracing both the registration and the assignment. The certificate of entry in the register would be *primâ facie* evidence of ownership. All that was asked for was that the owner of the copyright or the assignee of a musical work published before or after the commencement of this Act should, if he had not already registered, do so within a month either of the commencement of the Act or the publication of the work in the United Kingdom. This Act proposed to give the owner of the copyright power to arrest or to get a search warrant, and to enter the house of an Englishman, which was the Englishman's castle. If a man was to be granted such power was it too much to ask that by registering his copyright he should place his title beyond all question of dispute? How otherwise were they to know if a man claiming a song was really the owner of the copyright?

Another important point was as to when did the copyright begin? That was one of the most essential things in connection with the matter, because on it depended the date when it expired. That point was argued before the Royal Commission on Copyright in 1878. Copyright, be it remembered, lasted during the life time of its author and seven years beyond, or for forty-two years, whichever was the longer existence. These were important matters to bear in mind when they were proposing to hand over such drastic powers as were conferred by this Bill to the owners of musical copyrights. On what ground could they object to a clause of that kind? If the owner of a song thought he had a valuable property why should he object to pay the registration fee of 5s. at once instead of waiting to see if it should turn out a success? The next provision was that the registry book should set forth the true name and place of abode of the author and composer and the true name and abode of the owner of the copyright; otherwise the provisions of the Act should not apply. He was told there was objection to that. But why should there be? If a man was to have the privilege of securing the apprehension of another or of getting the issue of a search warrant with penal consequences, why in the world should he object to having his own name and address entered in the register as proof of his ownership? In dealing with the ownership of copyright why should a man register under a *nom de plume*? He would have to take legal proceedings in his own name, and surely in the case of criminal prosecutions it was only right he should use his own name. It would facilitate, too, the identification of the persons concerned; it would make their identity clear. For instance, there were hundreds of "John Smiths," but if they added the exact address identification was made easy. The real name and place of address was also essential in the matter of tracing assignments. The Copyright Commission in their Report stated that they were satisfied that registration under the present system was practically useless. Well, they could not possibly have criminal proceedings founded upon disputed titles of copyright. Then again, the Commission went on to say that great annoyance was caused to persons who were obliged to resort to the register whether for the purpose of registering works or of searching for entries on the register. It was reasonable to ask that the present system should be simplified. He took it that valuable copyrights were the very foundation of this Bill. A man was asked perhaps to buy such a copyright. Naturally he wanted to make sure that the copyright was a valid one, and he went to the register accordingly. If this clause were carried the scope of his search would be limited in area; he need only look over the register for one month from the date of the publication of the musical work and he would have a definite name and address to search for. If he did not find the entry he would know that the title was defective, thus this clause would constitute a protection for the public.

Again, the Royal Commission reported that they had been satisfied by the arguments in favour of registration that it was advisable to insist that it should be made more effective and complete, and that to this end it should be compulsory. Surely if that was the opinion in 1878, it was more than ever necessary now. What course was pursued in regard to patents and the Merchandise Marks Act? Did not this Bill follow the analogy of the latter? In the case of the Merchandise Marks Act there was compulsory registration, and as registration was to be the foundation of criminal proceedings under this Act, in the interests of the public the registration ought to be compulsory. In the Minority Report of the Musical Copyright Committee, he had distinctly stated that if proper safeguards for the public were provided he had no objection to the penal clauses or to the powers of apprehension and search, but he strongly held that those powers ought not to be given if the rights and necessary protection of the public were absolutely ignored. That was his position in moving this new clause, and he hoped the owners of valuable copyrights would not play into the hands of the owners of worthless copyrights by objecting to a clause which would affect only the latter. Under the Berne Convention, holders of foreign copyrights were entitled to the same privileges and protection as the people of the country concerned, and in the proposed new clause no distinction was made. The words were, "First publication in the United Kingdom," and the foreigner had the same month in which to register his copyright. Under Clause 15, the case of the foreigner was provided for, so that before he could take action the foreigner was obliged to register, and the proposed new clause simply put him in exactly the same position as the man in Bond Street. There would be no interference whatever with the validity of a copyright under the Act of 1842. The foreigner would have all the rights he at present enjoyed, but if he desired the benefits of the present Act he would have to comply with its requirements, and that surely was only fair. Those requirements were reasonable and necessary for the protection of the public. He begged to move.

Another clause (Registration by owner of copyright).

"The owner of the copyright, or his assignee, of every musical work, whether published before or after the commencement of this Act, shall, where not already done, within one month from the commencement of this Act, or within one month of the first publication of the musical work in the United Kingdom, whichever is the longer, make entry of the copyright in the registry book of the Stationers' Company in terms of The Copyright Act, 1842, and in the case of all musical works first published in the United Kingdom after the commencement of this Act the entry shall, in addition to the other requirements of the said Act, set forth the true name and place of abode of the author and composer and the true name and place of abode of the owner of the copyright, and otherwise the provisions of this Act shall not apply to such copyright."—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Brought up, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be now read a second time."

THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL (Sir EDWARD CARSON, Dublin University) said he was not in the least interested in this Bill, and intervened only because the Amendment raised a matter of public importance. Almost the whole basis of the hon. Member's argument was taken away by the fact that the House had already accepted an Amendment in the following terms—

> "This Act shall not apply to any musical copyright which is not registered in terms of The Copyright Act, 1842, and no proceedings shall be competent in respect of any offence committed prior to such registration."

What was the case as the Bill stood with that Amendment? It was quite right that a person who was to be prosecuted under the Act should have some means of ascertaining whether what he was doing was really illegal. By the Amendment which had been accepted no offence could take place under the Act unless the copyright had been registered; therefore an individual had only to go to Stationers' Hall to find out whether the music he proposed printing was pirated or not. Having obtained the information he could proceed or not as he chose, but if he went on he certainly did so wilfully, and ought to come under the stringent provisions of the Act. But the hon. Member desired to go further, and to say that not only must the copyright be registered before any offence could take place, but that the copyright might be lost if it was not registered within one month of the publication of the work in this country. Why that limit should be imposed he could not understand. So far as the pirate was concerned it was quite sufficient that the registration should take place before the act of piracy was committed. There also arose the question of what constituted publication in this country, and that might be a difficult matter to determine; at any rate there would be no hardship upon the would-be pirate, because under the Amendment already accepted he would have the opportunity of ascertaining whether he was pirating or not.

MR. CALDWELL said that was not the case. If the copyright was not registered the man could not possibly know whether he was pirating.

SIR EDWARD CARSON: Therefore he could not be prosecuted. He wanted to point out that they were attempting in the clause as at present framed to make it applicable to a person in a foreign country who had rights under foreign treaties with this country, and who had the right of registering in his own country not in any limited time, and he registered so as to be able to get certificates at Stationers' Hall. He asked the House not to interfere with these rights of foreigners; these matters had been carefully considered in the Act of 1886 which carried out the international obligations of this country. If they altered the law in this respect music might be published in this country and foreigners might have no opportunity of registering at all, and so they would be deprived of the advantages which international relations conferred upon them. Even if this clause was accepted it would certainly have to be considered carefully, as it would be impossible to interfere with those rights in an Act of this kind, which was merely to put an end to wilful piracy of a copyright of a British subject or of persons abroad who were in international relations with us and who gave us the same treatment.

MR. ATHERLEY-JONES (Durham, N.W.) said the Solicitor-General had raised two objections to the very reasonable proposal of the hon. Member for Mid-Lanark. He could not understand what objection there could be either on the part of the Government or on the part of the promoters to a proposal which was familiar in the law of every other country. All they wanted was that there should be registration of the copyright within a certain period of time. The Solicitor-General had said that they had already provided for registration, because no man could commence proceedings unless his music was registered. To his mind that was not sufficient protection, because a man wanted to know before he sold a copy of music that it was not a pirated copy, and his only means of ascertaining that would be by going to a public office in which a register was kept. It was not enough that the registration should be taken out immediately before or after the proceedings were initiated. His second objection was that the musical copyright was governed by treaty. So was the Patent Law, but that did not impair their right to make by statute such regulations as they pleased with regard to the efficacy of foreign patents in this country. The patent agents took good care that they informed the owners of foreign patents of any changes in the legislation or administration in this country, and therefore there was no difficulty in the matter. The third objection taken by the Solicitor-General was in regard to publication. What was publication? It was provided for in the Bill because it said that there must be publication, and that did not mean singing the song but publication as evidenced by the Act. This clause seemed to him a reasonable one, because he thought that facilities should be afforded on the one hand for preventing piracy, and on the other hand there should not be an injustice inflicted on those who unwittingly sold pirated copies.

MR. MALCOLM (Suffolk, Stowmarket) said that during the discussion of Clause 12 in Committee an Amendment was inserted upon this very question to meet the objections of the hon. Members opposite. Clause 12 of the present Bill provided that—

> "The proprietor of the copyright in any musical composition first published after the commencement of this Act, or his assignee, shall print or cause to be printed upon the title page of every published copy of such musical composition the date of the first publication thereof and otherwise this Act and the Act of 1902 shall not apply."

So that any person who wished to know whether he had got a pirated copy or not had only to see that it bore the date of publication. In the Grand Committee this clause was amended in accordance with the terms he had just read. The hon. Member for Mid Lanarkshire had told them a good deal about the *bona fides* which ought to exist, and he had said that if they accepted certain things on behalf of the promoters he understood that to mean that they would not go behind his back and insert those things which had been refused, in the House of Commons. He thought that principle ought also to hold good in the House of Commons in regard to compromises arrived at in the Grand Committee.

MR. CALDWELL: But those words were not accepted.

MR. HEMPHILL (Tyrone, N.): I know that there was no acceptance of those words in the Grand Committee.

MR. MALCOLM said there were one or two details in regard to this clause to which he wished to draw attention. If the owner of a copyright changed his address there might be hundreds of copies in stock, but not one of them would be valid because they would not contain the true name and address of the owner. As his right hon. friend had said, they had gone as far as they possibly could go in insisting upon compulsory registration. On behalf of the promoters he was not prepared to go any further to make it more difficult for the owners of copyright to come within the purview of this Act.

MR. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs) said that if it was true that thousands of pounds had been lost by the proprietors of copyright music owing to the system of piracy, all that this clause did was to insist upon them protecting themselves by going through the ordinary form of registration at Stationers' Hall. His hon. friend proposed that a month after publication the copyright should be registered. The hon. Member opposite had replied to this argument by saying that the date of publication was going to be printed on every copy. He would point out, however, that there was a very important difference. He might publish something to-day and if he had a provisional copy he could put any date on it which he liked. The House was not generally aware that at least half a dozen London newspapers were published of which they never heard anything, simply in order to protect the copyright. As to what was publication, it was decided almost every year in the Courts. It consisted in printing and publishing and selling across the counter to the public day by day or month by month. That would apply with regard to this case. If a piece of music was sold by an agent that would be publication. It seemed to him very extraordinary that a simple suggestion of this kind could not be accepted. What was the objection to it? All that was asked was that the publishers of music should be placed under what was the ordinary law in regard to copyright. If they thought they had a valuable piece of music which they desired to have copyrighted they should be obliged to send a copy of it to the Stationers' Hall and another copy to the British Museum.

MR. MOUNT: We are going to do that.

MR. DALZIEL asked what was the objection then to the proposal of his hon. friend. A period should be fixed within which the music should be formally registered. It was said that a prosecution could not take place unless the music was copyrighted. That was quite true, but it should be remembered that criminal proceedings were to take place in cases of infringement. Under the Bill as it stood, it would be possible to register and to take proceedings almost the following day. The obligation should not be put on the public of sending from day to day to the registration office to see what had been registered. He strongly urged the promoters of the Bill to adopt the suggestion of his hon. friend. They ought to do it in their own interest, and he could not see why they objected. It was of importance to publishers that the title of a song should be protected. If they did not protect it somebody else might come forward with an inferior piece of music with the same title which they themselves wished to employ.

MR. LLOYD MORGAN (Carmarthen, W.) said he was unable to understand why the promoters of the Bill were unwilling to accept the proposal of his hon. friend. He had not heard any reason which struck him as being sufficient for refusing to accept it. He was a member of the Standing Committee on Law, but he was not sure whether he was present when the clause to which his hon. friend referred came on. The fact that a clause was accepted or rejected in Committee did not preclude a Member from raising the question in the House if he desired to do so. When they said that a clause was passed by the Standing Committee on Law it merely meant that they took the best terms they could get there, but that was not a reason why they should not try to get better terms when the Bill came before the House. He agreed with the hon. and learned Gentleman opposite that there was a good deal to be said for amending the new clause. It might be that the clause ought to be very considerably amended. He did not think a month was a proper time. It was too short, and he would suggest that six months ought to be inserted. There certainly should be some period of time during which the owner of copyright ought to register if he wanted to get the benefit of the Bill. The Bill imposed penalties on people who printed, distributed, or sold, or were found to be in possession of copies of music which turned out to be pirated. Suppose a man purchased a large amount of music after finding out that it was not registered, and it was registered afterwards, it seemed to him that that man was to be penalised when he was found in possession of music which was not registered at the time he bought it. That was an extraordinary position to take up. He appreciated the answer which would be made. It would be said if he proved it was not registered at the time he bought it that would be a good defence. No doubt it would, for no magistrate would say that he sold music which he knew to be pirated. But though he could not be convicted he might be seriously penalised in other ways. He might have to meet a charge brought under the provisions of the Bill, which were of a very drastic character. He would also be a loser by the transaction as well, because once it was brought home to him that the music was registered he would not be able to sell it. He was not an opponent of the Bill, but he could not help feeling that if they were going to introduce a clause of this kind hon. Members were entitled to offer observations upon it.

MR. HARWOOD (Bolton) said the House was asked to adopt what was practically a new principle in regard to copyright. A register conducted in the way suggested by the Bill would be quite impracticable. Anyone who knew the immense number of pieces of music published knew that it would be impossible to search the register unless they were entered at the time of publication. There would be no difficulty in registration, but there would be difficulty and expense unless the pieces were entered at the time of publication. One of the peculiar features of pirated music was that it bore no date, and the consequence was that one would not be able to tell whether it was published before or after registration. The principle of the clause proposed by his hon. friend was that it would prevent the copyrighting of a lot of rubbish. A distinguished Judge said the other day it was a thousand pities that such rubbish could be copyrighted. If it was rubbish they would not spend five shillings in registering it. An infringement of the provision of the Bill would involve a criminal prosecution, and surely they had a right to ask for some practical reason against the proposal of his hon. friend.

*MR. MOUNT suggested that if the hon. Member would substitute twelve months for one month the promoters would accept the proposal.

*MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty) said he objected to any extension of the time. In his view one month was ample. Why should all this special care and attention be paid to composers of music? Let them take action at once, if they considered they had a good thing, and protect themselves.

*MR. SPEAKER said he understood that the Second Reading of the clause had been accepted. When the clause had been read a second time the hon. Member could move an Amendment to it.

Question put, and agreed to.

MR. GALLOWAY (Manchester, S.W.) said that in order to put matters straight he formally moved to leave out the words "one month," in order to insert "twelve months."

Amendment proposed to the clause—

"In line 3, to leave out the words 'one month' and insert the words 'twelve months.'" —(*Mr. Galloway.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

*MR. WEIR said that if a man had what he conceived to be a valuable property, whether a musical composition or mechanical invention, he should protect himself at once by registration. If he did not care to take that trouble, then he should suffer the consequences. He thought twelve months was altogether too long. A prior usage nullified a patent; why should not prior usage nullify a musical production which had not been registered? He should vote for one month instead of twelve.

LORD EDMUND FITZMAURICE (Wiltshire, Cricklade) said he hoped his hon. friend would not press his opposition to the Motion now before the House. He was Chairman of the Committee which had considered this Bill, and had followed the discussions very closely. The question which had raised a great deal of difficulty upstairs was that of international copyright. He understood that this concession went a very long way to meet that difficulty, and that if it were not made a great deal of hardship might be inflicted on foreign composers.

Question put, and negatived.

Question "That those words be there inserted" put, and agreed to.

Clause, as amended, added.

MR. CALDWELL said that this Amendment was consequential on the last. In the first clause he dealt with the original owner of the copyright; in this clause he was dealing with the assignee of the copyright. When the original owner of the copyright had the power of prosecution under this Act after it became law, it was equally necessary that the assignee's title to do so should be made clear. Therefore the public had a right to know who was the real owner of the copyright. Piracy meant the publication of musical works without the written consent of the owner, and therefore to whom was a man who wanted to publish a work to go in order to obtain authority to publish that music? Suppose a man wanted to act honourably and wished to say to the owner of the copyright: "Are you willing to allow me to publish this music?" But the real owner, the assignee, was not registered at all, what happened? The object of his Amendment was that the assignee should go to the registrar and put his true name and address on the register, so that the public might know who was really the owner of the copyright. He begged to move.

Another clause (Registration of assignments of copyright).

> "The assignee of the copyright of any musical work first published in the United Kingdom after the commencement of this Act shall within one month of his becoming assignee of such musical copyright, cause an entry to be made in the registry book of the Stationers' Company kept in terms of The Copyright Act, 1842, setting forth his true name and address, and the deed of assignment or other deed or title under which he became and is assignee, and otherwise the provisions of this Act shall not apply to such copyright.'"—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Brought up, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause be now read a second time."

MR. GALLOWAY said he quite recognised the spirit in which the hon. Gentleman had moved this Amendment. But the objection he had was to the words at the end of the clause, which provided that in the registry book of the Stationers' Company there should be set forth the true name and address of the assignee and "the deed of assignment or other deed or title under which he became and is assignee." That would compel the publication, and therefore the putting in the hands of the public the private transactions between the publisher and the composer. The rest of the hon. Gentlemen's clause he was prepared to accept.

MR. HEMPHILL asked would it suffice if the name and address and the date of the deed of assignment were set forth. That would obviate the necessity of setting forth the deed itself.

SIR EDWARD CARSON said he would point out that the assignment of a foreign copyright would be in the books of a foreign country. All that was now necessary under international arrangement was that the assignee would lodge a proper certificate in this country. He did not see how the proposed clause could apply.

*MR. H. D. GREENE (Shrewsbury) said that under the proposed clause, if the assignee did not register his assignment within a month, he would forever lose all right under the statute. It appeared to him that a *locus penetentiœ* should be given in such cases; and that the assignee should be given the benefit of the Act when he did register. Therefore the clause should end "or until he shall so register it."

*SIR FRANCIS POWELL (Wigan) said that there was no reason for making the Bill more severe than the Copyright Act. The Act of 1842 did not enforce the statement of a date. It was very undesirable to encumber a new Bill with restrictions and difficulties of this kind.

Question put, and agreed to.

MR. GALLOWAY said he would move to omit "one month" in order to insert "twelve months."

Amendment proposed to the clause—

> "In line 3, to leave out the words 'one month' and insert the words 'twelve months.'"—(*Mr. Galloway.*)

Amendment agreed to.

MR. GALLOWAY said he would move to omit the following words: "and the deed of assignment or other deed or title under which he became and is assignee." He would take care that the arrangement which had been arrived at should be honourably carried out.

Amendment proposed to the clause—

> "In line 6, to leave out the words 'and the deed of assignment or other deed or title under which he became and is assignee.'"—(*Mr. Galloway.*)

MR. CALDWELL said that this was a matter in which there should be no misunderstanding. All he wanted was to fix, as it were, the title under which the assignee secured the copyright. He quite accepted the hon. Gentleman's assurance, and would agree to the Amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

MR. HEMPHILL said it would be necessary to insert words in lieu of the words that had been omitted. He would suggest "the date of the deed of assignment or other instrument, if any."

MR. GALLOWAY said he had given the House an undertaking, and would ask the hon. Gentleman to accept his word. They were all agreed; and he would undertake that there would be no attempt to go back on the arrangement which had been arrived at.

*MR. WEIR asked if the date would be inserted.

MR. GALLOWAY said that words would be inserted which would make the matter clear.

*MR. H. D. GREENE moved to add the following words, "until it has been so registered."

Amendment proposed to the clause—

"At the end to add the words 'until it has been so registered.'"—(*Mr. H. D. Greene.*)

Question proposed, "That these words be there added."

MR. CALDWELL said that the Amendment would stultify the whole clause.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Clause, as amended, added.

*MR. SPEAKER: The first Amendment in the name of the hon. Gentleman the Member for North-West Durham is not in order, because it is not relevant to the present Bill, as it would merely give power to diminish in certain cases the right of the holder of a copyright. The second Amendment of the hon. Gentleman is in order.

MR. ATHERLEY-JONES said the Amendment he would move went to the root of the Bill. It was not, however, destructive in its character, but it introduced a very material modification. The Bill, of course, had been conceived in the interests of the music publishers rather than in the interests of the public, though he did not complain of that. That objection was met because this clause was rather against the interest of the publishers than in their favour. Undoubtedly the lion's share of the profits of the music went to the trade; a very small proportion went to the composer. No one had much sympathy with publishers because of the profits made by them. Of course the profits made by the music publishers varied and they could only take an average in matters of this kind. He might point out that the average profit to the composer would be about 2d. for every copy sold, whilst it would be a very moderate computation if they said that the publishers' profit was 1s. A grievance then clearly existed. The effect of these high prices in music was that the public were not able to obtain music with that facility which they desired. There was a very strong combination among the music publishers of this country who dictated the prices to the trade. He merely wished to put this matter in an open form before those who were in charge of this Bill who, he admitted, had met in a most reasonable manner the objections which had been made to this Bill. The clause he was proposing was open to some very strong objections and in the opinion of some might seem rather harsh, but having regard to the knowledge obtained from the working of the Copyright Act of 1842, and of the Patent Acts, he thought it would work very well in practice. Inasmuch as they were satisfied that the demand of the populace for musical culture had largely increased, and that complaints were constantly being made by the people of the high prices at which music was sold, it was only right that the requirements of the poorer classes should be to some extent safeguarded by this House, and what he proposed was this: that when anyone was summoned for an offence under this Act, it should be open, not only to the party summoned, but to anybody, to point out to the magistrate that the facilities for the public for obtaining this music were of an unsatisfactory character, and that the prices charged were prohibitive, and that the magistrate should then be empowered, if he thought fit, to impose a nominal fine or deal with the action as frivolous. Under the Patent Acts the practice was somewhat different. Under the Patent Acts anyone could go to the Privy Council and show that there was no proper opportunity for the public to acquire a patented article, and the Privy Council could order greater facilities to be afforded. Under the Copyright Act of 1842, it was competent for the Privy Council to proceed under somewhat analogous methods. If the proprietor of the copyright of any book, after the death of the author of that book, refused to re-publish it, and it was to the benefit of the public that it should be re-published, an application might be made to the Privy Council, who, under the circumstances, could grant a licence to the applicant to publish the book despite the provisions of the Copyright Act. He was quite sensible to the objections to which the clause was open through leaving this discretionary power in the hands of the magistrates, but it must be remembered that a magistrate had now the power to dismiss a charge he considered frivolous. He begged to move.

Another clause (Discretion of Court as regards fine and costs).

"Where in any proceedings before a Court of summary jurisdiction under this Act, the Court is satisfied with regard to any musical work that the reasonable requirements of the public with reference to such musical work have not been satisfied, the Court in its discretion may refuse to grant a search warrant, and where an offence is proved may impose a nominal fine, and the cost in the action or proceedings shall be in the absolute discretion of the Court."—(*Mr. Atherley-Jones.*)

Brought up, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. COCHRANE, Ayrshire, N.) said the objection to this clause had been stated by the hon. Member who moved it. The prices of music, like the price of other things, were not independent of the law of supply and demand. All the protection that the hon. Member wanted was given already in the Summary Jurisdiction Acts, in Sections 16 and 18 of the Acts of 1879 and 1848 respectively, which declared that if at the hearing of a charge for an offence punishable by a Court of summary jurisdiction the Court thought that, though the charge was proved, the offence was of so trifling a nature that it was inexpedient to inflict any punishment, the Court might dismiss the information; and again, if the information were dismissed, the prosecutor might be rendered liable for costs. Under all the circumstances he did not think it would be convenient to add this clause to the Bill.

MR. HARWOOD said this matter was more important than the hon. Gentleman seemed to suppose. The prices of music were prohibitive, and the question of supply and demand was not allowed to operate in the matter. It was all a matter of a close corporation, and those who were acquainted with its working knew that it worked in a very injurious way, with the result that preposterous prices were charged for songs. The almost invariable minimum price was 4s., and the cost of publication was about twopence. Yet anybody who desired to publish a song was bound to come into the ring or else he could not get his song published. This was a matter which this House ought to consider. They had to consider not only the rights of the publishers but also the rights of the public. The public ought not to be shut out from purchasing music by the prohibitive prices charged. Such conditions should be laid down as would ensure that if it was desirable for the public to have a piece of music they should be able to obtain it at a reasonable charge, and if they could not get it they should be able to assert their rights. The reason it was not necessary to discuss this question of piracy with regard to books was because the publishers of books were wise enough to publish them at reasonable prices. It might be said that even if accepted this clause would not be put into operation very much, but his contention was that the effect of its being in the Bill would be that such steps would be taken by the publishers as would prevent its being put into operation at all. He appealed to the House that in this matter they should do something to meet the demands of the public.

*MR. WEIR expressed surprise at the attitude of the Solicitor-General, who must know that an inventor in order to protect himself should take immediate steps to patent his invention and that prior use invalidated a patent. Why should so much care, consideration, and regard be bestowed on the owner and composer of a piece of music? Why should he not register his production as soon as he completed it? A month, as proposed in the Amendment, gave ample time to any author, composer, or owner to register. It was not fair to the innocent vendor of a piece of music that he should be the victim of legal proceedings, although he had adopted every means to ascertain whether the music he offered for sale was pirated. Registration was often delayed until legal proceedings had commenced. What an injustice to the enterprising trader! He came to the House to-day to support the Bill, if a good one, but after listening to the debate he had come to the conclusion it was a bad Bill. He considered it a shameful attempt to bolster up a rich and powerful combination to the detriment of the public. He was not adverse to an author, composer, or inventor securing the largest possible profit, but the fact should not be lost sight of that Parliament granted a privilege in the protection of copyright, and in doing so required that the rights of the public should also be recognised. This powerful ring in charging four shillings for a piece of music which could be sold for sixpence, at an enormous profit, catered for the wealthy classes only. By all means let the æsthetic millionaires have costly editions, which might bear on the cover hand-painted violins, other musical instruments, and cupids, at, say, five guineas and upwards. But for the masses of the people there should be an edition at a price within their reach. Why should the jaded shop or factory girl who found a solace in music be unable to cultivate her taste? An edition at, say, sixpence a copy selling in hundreds of thousands would prove far more profitable to the composer, owner, and vendor than a limited sale at four shillings. Railway companies long since realised that their largest revenue was derived from third-class passengers. This combination of music publishers did not seem to have grasped the fact that large sales at moderate profits produced the best results. He objected to one-sided legislation in the interest of monopolists. The taste for music in this country was growing and should be encouraged.

*MR. H. D. GREENE said it was with a feeling of humiliation that he sat through a debate in which the statute law of England was bartered away by hon. Members from one side to those on the other. Hon. Members had already repealed the statute which was passed in 1902 after careful consideration. It was difficult to sit still while such things were going on; but he could not see the criminal law of the country reversed and upset by bargains between hon. Members. The Under-Secretary's protest was half-hearted, and if the proposed clause were not rejected or decisively challenged by anyone else he would divide the House himself. The clause proposed that where proceedings were taken before a Court of summary jurisdiction the Court might refuse to grant a search warrant, impose a merely nominal fine, and exercise absolute discretion in regard to costs, if it was satisfied that the reasonable requirements of the public with reference to the musical work which was the subject of the proceedings had not been satisfied. His first observation in regard to the clause was that it was absolutely unnecessary, because under the general law and Summary Jurisdiction Act the Court already had discretion to reduce imprisonment or fine and to deal with the question of costs. That was provided for in Section 4 of the Act of 1879. Then, again, he would call attention to the fact that there was no minimum fine which the magistrates could, under the Bill, impose; it was in their power to impose any penalty they chose so long as they did not exceed the maximum. It was, therefore, an absolutely unnecessary and redundant provision to insert in the Bill.

The conditions of the clause were objectionable. Who was to show the justices whether the reasonable requirements of the public with reference to a musical work had not been satisfied? What were the means of investigating this question? The hon. Member who moved the clause said something about some person coming in to satisfy the justices. Did he really mean that when a man was being criminally prosecuted some third party might be introduced, possibly with not very laudable motives, to start an inquiry not as to whether the prisoner was guilty but whether or not the reasonable requirements of the public had been satisfied? How could prosecutions be conducted under such circumstances? It meant that the ordinary practices of the magistrate's Court were to be absolutely annihilated, and it certainly seemed to him to be unjust to the accused person that an element of such a disturbing kind should be introduced for the consideration of the Court while the question of his guilt or innocence was under consideration. He ventured to assert that there were no means of investigating whether or not the reasonable requirements of the public—whatever they might be—had been satisfied. The proposition that when the Court was solemnly trying whether a man was guilty or not guilty of forgery it was to stop to consider whether somebody else had or had not satisfied the public requirements should only need to be mentioned in order to be scouted. The man being tried might have all the appliances of forgery —a complete establishment for forging musical copyrights—his guilt might have been brought home to him, and yet the magistrates were invited to let a guilty man escape because some want of the public was not satisfied. That was totally illogical. If it might be applied in the case of musical copyright, why not in other cases? Why should the justices be asked to entertain entirely extraneous considerations in these cases?

This position had arisen from an entire misapprehension of the Act passed in 1886. Up to that year if a person was guilty of producing a musical piece, or singing a song, the owner of that piece or song, if he had not given his sanction to the performance, could sue the performer in the High Court, and, if the action was successful, the offender had to pay forty shillings for every representation together with double the costs of the suit. That was a civil action but it was a harsh proceeding, because many people quite inadvertently sang copyright songs. Owing to the scandal caused by the operation of that law, Parliament interfered in 1886, and provided that in such actions the jury might only give a nominal amount of damages instead of forty shillings for each representation, and, instead of allowing double the costs of the suit, the amount of costs was to be left to the discretion of the Judge. He took it that the hon. Member opposite had forgotten that that Act only applied to civil actions, and had nothing to do with the Act of 1889.

*Mr. SOARES (Devonshire, Barnstaple) said, as one who supported the Bill, and who hoped it would pass through the Report Stage that afternoon, he trusted that the promoters would see their way to accept this clause, or, at any rate, some modification of it. He admitted that he did not quite like the clause as it stood at present, inasmuch as it contained a great deal of surplusage, but he wished to see some means devised which would prevent a rich man from purchasing the copyright of some newly composed piece of music, and restricting its performance to his family circle or his friends. There was nothing in the Bill to prevent a man from so purchasing a piece which might be as valuable as Handel's *Messiah*, and thus inflicting a serious loss on the public. It might be said that when a man bought a picture the public had no means of access to inspect it, but when the day came for legislation with regard to them he would be prepared to advocate the same course to be taken in regard to pictures as in regard to music. The Bill was admittedly a new departure in legislation, and therefore, they ought to make it as perfect as possible.

Mr. BOUSFIELD (Hackney, N.) said he was one of these who fully appreciated the motives of some hon. Members on the other side of the House who had endeavoured to defeat this Bill; but he could not understand that their object was altogether laudable. They had been impressed with the fact that musical publications were sold at a very high price, and acting, as they believed, in the interests of the public, they were attempting to secure facilities being given to the public to obtain cheaper music.

He had a substantial interest in one of the larger musical publishing firms, and he was convinced that it was not only in the interests of the public but of the shareholders of these firms that an endeavour should be made to meet the popular demand for cheap music. A good many publishers had made a strenuous effort to publish cheap music, but their efforts had been frustrated by the pirates. One firm of publishers had been good enough to send him a large number of popular songs, published at 6d., among which was "An Old Love Dream," sung by Madame Belle Cole. But it was no good publishing these songs at 6d. if a few days afterwards they were hawked about at 2d. or 3d. It had been suggested that the cost of publication was extremely small; but this was to ignore some of the heavy expenses which had to be incurred. A relative of his who used to write songs for a firm of publishers received from them £800 a year, in return for which he sent them about a dozen songs a year. He also received a royalty after a thousand copies had been sold. There was, therefore, a very large expense involved in the publication of these songs. Moreover, many songs did not take hold of the public, and the publishers had to take the risk of the songs attaining popularity. As to the Amendment, there was too much of the personal equation in it. If the matter was left entirely to the discretion of the magistrates, different standards might be established all over the country as to what were "the reasonable requirements of the public," and, therefore, he thought this proposal could not practically be carried into effect.

*MR. SPEAKER: Those questions are not raised by this Amendment. The question is whether the magistrates in cases of this kind are to be empowered to consider the question of "the reasonable requirements of the public." It is merely a question whether that power is to be granted or not, and not what those reasonable requirements are.

MR. BRIGG (Yorkshire, W.R., Keighley) said he had had some experience upon this question, and he had heard many legal gentlemen plead before him, and he had always found that one good lawyer was able to reply to another. When a person applied for a search warrant he had to state the circumstances, and the magistrate must decide upon them. Under this Bill the magistrate was called upon to give a definite decision, and that was just where he could make use of this provision and use his discretion. There ought to be no politics in this question, and the object of hon. Members on both sides of the House ought to be to see that the public got as much cheap music as possible. Any proposal that would effect this object would be appreciated on both sides of the House. He thought the Amendment now before the House would have this effect, and it would make it easier to obtain better music at cheaper rates.

MR. ALEXANDER CROSS (Glasgow, Camlachie) said he felt that the law was at present harsh in its operation and very much restricted as regarded the public interest, and in this Bill there ought to be reasonable proposals to moderate those restrictions, and make less severe the hardships which had been felt in the operation of the present law. The provision in the proposed clause seemed to be a very reasonable one, for in a matter of this sort the discretion of the magistrates ought to play some part in guiding them to a decision. If the supporters of this Bill were desirous that the law should be made more reasonable and less oppressive, perhaps they could suggest some better proposal than this Amendment. Instead of doing this the supporters of the Bill seemed to be insisting upon having their pound of flesh in the interests of the copyright owners. He held no brief for the musical copyright owners, but under the circumstances he had no alternative but to give the hon. Member for Mid Lanark all the assistance he could in order to prevent this Bill passing into law in its present shape.

MR. CALDWELL said this clause represented the rights of the public in this matter of copyright. The owners of copyright music were asking for drastic legislation of a kind which was not possessed by anyone else, and the Opposition were asking, in return for that, that they should in this Bill give some recognition to the principle that the public had some right and interest in the question of musical copyright. Like all other rights conferred by Parliament, they should be exercised reasonably and in the interests of the public. What had these copyright people done? Both before the Committee and even now, they said that they did not recognise any interest on the part of the public because copyrights were personal property. In his opinion, if copyright owners were to have these drastic powers, which were not possessed by owners of anything else in the kingdom; if they were to be given powers of obtaining search warrants, and such penalties as could be inflicted under this Bill, then at least they ought to show before the magistrates that the reasonable requirements of the public were being satisfied. The cause of piracy was the difference between the exorbitant price charged to the public and the price at which the music could be produced. Mr. D'Eyncourt, a well-known metropolitan magistrate, said he wondered why copyright owners did not reduce the price of their music, and he further stated that so long as the present price of music was maintained they would always have this kind of thing going on. He also said that he wondered why copyright owners did not look at the matter in a more sensible way and lower the price. Here they had the opinion of a well-known magistrate who conscientiously believed that the cause of piracy in music was due to these high prices. The magistrates would have no discretion whatever under this Bill, and they would have to grant a warrant. They wanted to put the magistrates in this position, that they would have an indication from Parliament that they would be allowed to bring their discretion to bear, and refuse to grant a search warrant where, in their opinion, the reasonable requirements of the public had not been met. It had been said that they were now dealing with a new state of things, and that nothing would meet the case but a search warrant. Look at the position of the public with regard to this Amendment. Up to this moment there had been no recognition whatever of the rights of the public as regarded their reasonable requirements. They were anxious to put into this Bill power to enable the Privy Council to determine what were the reasonable requirements of the public; but they found that they could not get such a provision into this measure. Therefore they were quite willing to take the other reasonable position, and provide that the magistrate should have the discretion provided for in this Amendment. Parliament in the year 1888 found that the owners of copyright were acting unreasonably in the matter, and consequently power was given to modify the penalty, and the question of costs was also left to the discretion of the magistrates. They were only asking for the recognition of that principle here. They wanted the magistrates to have this power, for if they possessed such power, in his opinion, it would be sufficient to bring about a change. If the promoters of this Bill went on pressing these proposals in the face of these facts, and if they resisted the acknowledgment of the rights of the public, which were not in any way recognised in this Bill, the House would do right is coming to the conclusion that it was impossible to grant these drastic powers. If they would only recognise the rights of the public in this limited sense of giving a discretion to the magistrates, then he should certainly not oppose them being granted the extreme powers now being asked for.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 74; Noes, 161. (Division List No. 144)

AYES.

Austin, Sir John
Barlow, John Emmott
Boland, John
Brigg, John
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Burt, Thomas
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Crombie, John William
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Donelan, Captain A.
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellice, Capt. E. C (SAndrw'sBghs
Fenwick, Charles
Ffrench, Peter
Hammond, John
Hayden, John Patrick

Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones, William(Carnarvonshire
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kilbride, Denis
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M‘Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Partington, Oswald
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Priestley, Arthur
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Rigg, Richard
Roe, Sir Thomas
Russell, T. W.
Schwann, Charles E.
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sheehy, David
Slack, John Bamford
Sullivan, Donal
Thomas, D. Alfred (Merthyr)
Ure, Alexander
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, Jn. Cathcart (Orkney)
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Atherley-Jones and Mr. Harwood.

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex.F.
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Aird, Sir John
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt.Hn. Sir H
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W. (Leeds
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boulnois, Edmund
Bousfield, William Robert
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Campbell, Rt.Hn.J.A.(Glasgow
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb, Rt.Hn. Sir John C. R.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Craig, Charles Curtis(Antrim,S.
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan)
Dickson, Charles Scott
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir F. Dixon
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duke, Henry Edward
Dunn, Sir William
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt.Hn.Sir J.(Manc'r
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gardner, Ernest
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert Jn.
Gordon, Hn.J.E.(Elgin&Nairn)
Gore, Hn G.R.C.Ormsby-(Salop
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Grant, Corrie
Green, Walford D.(Wednesbury
Greene, Sir E.W(B'rySEdm'nds
Greene, Henry D.(Shrewsbury)
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Gunter, Sir Robert
Hardy, L. (Kent, Ashford)
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Heath, Arthur Howard(Hanley
Heath, James (Staffords., N.W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hope, J.F.(Sheffield, Brightside
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Howard, Jn. (Kent, Faversham
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hn. Arthur Fred.
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Kennedy, Patrick James
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham)
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Lloyd-George, David
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M‘Iver, Sir Lewis(Edinburgh,W
M‘Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Malcolm, Ian
Maxwell, W.J.H. (Dumfriessh.)
Milner, Rt.Hn. Sir Frederick G.
Milvain, Thomas
Mitchell, William (Burnley)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morpeth, Viscount
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Nolan, Col.John P.(Galway,N.)
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Paulton, James Mellor
Peel, Hn.Wm.Robert Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Price, Robert John
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Rankin, Sir James
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rothschild, Hon.Lionel Walter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Sandys, Lt.-Col. Thos. Myles
Seely, Maj.J.E.B.(Isle of Wight
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand
Soares, Ernest J.
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Rt.Hn.C.R(Northants
Spencer, Sir E.(W. Bromwich)
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Talbot, Rt.Hn.J.G(Oxf'dUniv.
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Wallace, Robert
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Welby, Lt.-Col.A.C.E(Taunton

Whiteley, H.(Ashton und.Lyne
Wilson, J.W.(Worcestersh., N.)
Wodehouse, Rt.Hn. E.R.(Bath
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Mount and Mr. Galloway.

MR. HARWOOD said he desired to move the Amendment on the Paper standing in the name of the hon. Member for North-west Durham. They were now discussing a very serious departure in English law which ought not to be adopted except very good causes were shown. Already music had more legal safeguards than any other productions of a similar nature. Music had all the protection afforded to books and other productions, and it was specially protected by the power of seizure, and the House ought to be very careful before it took a step of the kind proposed in this Bill. They ought to ask themselves the question, "Why do these people come here for protection?" Why was the House of Commons asked to deal with this case specially, and to adopt special provisions to deal with a certain class of copyright? They were being asked in this case to go beyond the ordinary criminal law. The House ought not to do this without having sufficient cause shown. Why did this particular trade ask them to apply remedies which no other trade possessed? Those who opposed this Bill were not unreasonable, but they did maintain that a good case ought to be made out before such proposals were passed into law. There were some very serious factors in this problem. This was a disease, and the House of Commons was being asked to apply a very severe remedy. They must ask what was the cause of this disease. The real cause was that the whole trade of musical publication was rotten. It was conducted upon the principle of a close corporation, and the whole thing was in the hands of a few. It was a trust, and it was one of the most outrageous examples of a trust. Not only was the printing of music conducted upon this close corporation principle, but it was a fact that anyone who did not fall in with the lines adopted by these people had no chance at all.

The House might perhaps forget that it was being asked that afternoon to do something which ought not to be done without a great sense of responsibility. They were asked to bring in the severity of the criminal law and the power of seizure on behalf of a particular trade. Was that trade meeting the difficulty properly itself? They were asked on behalf of music publishers and music sellers to give them these powers. Had the House not a right to say to them, "Are you doing all that we can fairly expect of you to stop this disease." He agreed that piracy prevailed largely, but it was inevitable under the circumstances, and it was only the natural result of the rotten condition of the whole business. He thought the House ought to insist that the music publishers on their part should do all that could be reasonably expected of them to cure this disease. [Cries of "Oh!"] His argument was not to be answered by exclamations of that kind. They had just heard the opinion of a well-known magistrate upon this question, and he had told them that the real cause of piracy was the absurdly high price of music. Everyone knew how perfectly absurd the price of music was. Music was now published at preposterous prices and this Bill bolstered up a most ridiculous way of doing business. Whilst he acknowledged the elasticity shown by the promoters to the opponents of this Bill, all they had conceded did not meet the case. The music trade ought to be put on a sound business-like basis. But there was a deeper question. He did not know if hon. Members had fully recognised how enormously the taste for music in recent years had developed amongst the masses of the people. They could not buy music now at a reasonable price except in a roundabout way, and they ought to be able to buy music which was now sold at 1s. 4d. at 4d. and 6d.

*MR. SPEAKER: That question cannot be discussed upon this clause.

MR. HARWOOD said that by moving this Amendment he was practically moving the rejection of the Bill. The position was simply this. This House was now asked to pass more stringent legislation to protect a trade which was already well protected. Before the House passed this measure they ought at least to receive every assurance that the publishers would put their trade upon a proper footing. Because no such assurances had been given, and because he believed that if this Bill passed the evils complained of would be intensified and the masses of the people would be shut out from obtaining cheap music, he begged to move the deletion of Clause 1.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 1, line 5, to leave out Clause 1."—(*Mr. Harwood.*)

Question proposed, "That the words of the clause to the word 'or,' in page 1, line 6, stand part of the Bill.'"

MR. GALLOWAY said the hon. Member for Bolton had been good enough to say that the objections raised to this Bill had been met in a reasonable spirit.

MR. HARWOOD: Hear, hear!

MR. GALLOWAY said he was glad to hear that acknowledgment. There were five clauses standing in the name of the hon. Member for Mid.-Lanark and they had accepted four of them, and in regard to his fifth clause the mover admitted that it was not a practical one and would not work. When the Bill was read a second time hon. Members on the other side professed that they were anxious to prevent piracy, and to enable the owners of property to have the proper use of their property. In regard to the Amendments proposed by the hon. Member for Mid. Lanark the promoters of the Bill had given way a good deal—more than they might otherwise have done—because there was only one day for the discussion of the Bill. He hoped that the House would see that it was passed in some form. The only desire the promoters had was to give those who possessed property the right of enjoying it, and he hoped they would not allow the House of Commons to suffer under the stigma of having refused a just and proper remedy for an intolerable condition of things.

MR. CALDWELL said those who were promoting the Bill were promoting it from the point of view of property. Property was the word used by the hon. Member for South West Manchester. The hon. Member said, "Oh, it's like your watch."

MR. GALLOWAY: I never said anything of the kind.

MR. CALDWELL said that, at any rate, the hon. Member's argument was all to that effect. Copyright was an interest conferred by Parliament for the promotion of music among the community, while at the same time giving reasonable remuneration to the composer. It was not property in the same sense as a watch which a man could use, sell, or deal with as he pleased for all eternity. A watch could be handed down on the hereditary principle. Copyright was limited in its duration and it was clogged about with restrictions. Had Parliament dealt with the question as a vested interest? In 1888, owing to the abuses on the part of the owners of copyright, Parliament stepped in and said, "We will curtail your right which you say is a right of property," and absolute discretion was given to the Judges to give nominal damages and to determine who should pay the costs of proceedings. This Bill wanted to give increased powers to the publishers of music, and it was a matter of the most vital interest that he House should consider whether those powers ought to be granted, having regard to the whole circumstances of the case. The powers asked by the musical copyright people were not granted in any of the other copyright laws of this country. Those powers were asked on account of the course pursued by the music publishers themselves. They charged such exorbitant prices for the music they published that there was a temptation to piracy in the very same way as when a Customs duty was high there was a temptation to smuggling. No better evidence of that could be found than in the action of the stipendiary magistrates. They knew the piracy existed and they knew the popular sentiment was against the music publishers on account of the high prices which they charged. That was the reason why piracy had increased. The Under-Secretary for the Home Department had told them that the effect of the discussion of musical copyright was that prices were going to come down.

Take the case of one publisher—the president of the Musical Copyright Association. He had brought out a sixpenny series of music exactly the same in form and substance, and everything else, as the 4s. and the 2s. pieces.

MR. MALCOLM: How much of that has been pirated?

MR. CALDWELL: Well, a good deal has been pirated.

MR. MALCOLM: Out of seventy-eight there have been thirty-nine pirated.

MR. CALDWELL said it was because the songs were popular that they were pirated. If they had not been pirated the hon. Member for South-west Manchester would have got up and said that those songs which were sold at sixpence were rubbish. The publisher to whom he had referred sold the sixpenny series to the trade at twopence and that included copyright, advertising, and other expenses. The ordinary trader sold it at 4½d., and the hawker, who had another class of customers, sold it at 3d. or 3½d. That took place last October. When the music publishers came to this House asking further powers, they should remember that they would have popular sentiment to reckon with in a matter of this kind. They were already beginning to realise it. It took a long time to educate the public, but in course of time they did waken up. The musical copyright people asked power to proceed against the printers and the man who caused pirated music to be printed. Nobody would have the slightest sympathy with them, and for his part he would not modify in any way the penalty proposed so far as they were concerned. But there were other parties involved—those who had little shops, and those who hawked in the streets. It was proposed to put these people under the most drastic legislation. He had never concealed his view that, given proper recognition of the rights of the public, he did not object to the most stringent law to put down piracy. The new clauses were brought forward in the hope that proper recognition of the public rights might be placed on the Statute-book, but the publishers had not shown the smallest inclination to meet the public demand. It was impossible to carry out criminal legislation of the kind now proposed unless they had popular sentiment at the back of it. There was in the Act of 1892 a most effective law against piracy. They found that seizures of music were constantly being made under the powers conferred by that Act, and in his opinion publishers had already ample protection. There was no evidence that they had sustained any very substantial loss. The remedy for piracy was not that proposed by the Bill. The remedy lay in the hands of the publishers themselves.

MAJOR SEELY (Isle of Wight) asked the hon. Member for Bolton not to press his Motion which, as had been frankly admitted, was designed to defeat the Bill. There seemed to be an impression that the object of the Bill was to benefit the publishers of music. He knew nothing of the publishers of music, but he knew something of the composers. One of the principal sufferers was a constituent of his, the composer of the best known songs throughout the English-speaking world, and the system of piracy which had grown up had involved him in the loss of thousands of pounds. For every publisher there were dozens of composers, every one of whom was a sufferer.

*MR. WEIR said he was sure every Member must sympathise with the composers, but the music publishers were to blame for the loss which they suffered. The promoters of the Bill had appealed to the House to allow it to pass. He had been in the House the greater part of the afternoon, and there had been very little of a conciliatory spirit shown by the promoters of the Bill. They had given way on one or two small points, but it was important that the interests of the public should be considered as well as those of the publishers to whom Parliament had given a privilege. He was as much a stickler for the rights of property as any man, but they must also consider the welfare of the community. They all recognised that music should be sold at a price within the reach of the masses of the people. Sub-section 2 of Clause 1 said that any person who distributed or carried about any copies of pirated music was liable to certain penalties. If he happened to have half-a-dozen copies, or even one single copy, of a piece of music in his pocket to give to a friend, it might be said that he was distributing it, although he had no knowledge whatever that the music was pirated, and he would be liable to conviction under this Bill and to all the penalties provided in it. Although he wished to give these copies of a piece of music to his friends out of the goodness of his heart, he could be attacked by this powerful organisation of music publishers, who were already amply protected under the existing law. Then Sub-section 3 said if any person "sells, or causes, or procures to be sold, or exposes, offers, or keeps for sale, or solicits orders by post, or otherwise, for any copies of any pirated musical work." How was a buyer to know that the music was pirated——

*MR. SPEAKER said that the hon. Member was going through the Bill line by line, and delaying the business of the House.

*MR. WEIR said that the powers sought by the promoters of this Bill were of such an arbitrary character that he did not think the House ought to grant them for the benefit of any trading body. He knew of no law conferring on any other set of traders such powers and privileges as was proposed to be given to music publishers. The public welfare should be regarded first, and the music publishers should not have the power to treat the public in such a high-handed fashion as the Bill proposed to allow them. He sincerely trusted that the House would not pass legislation of this kind. If the promoters of the Bill had been more conciliatory more progress would have been made.

Question put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In Clause 1, page 1, line 6, after the word, 'Prints,' to insert the words 'for sale.'"—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

MR. CALDWELL said that in any copyright Act since 1842 the words used were "causes to be printed for sale," and the same should be adopted in this Bill.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In Clause 1, page 1, line 6, to leave out the words 'or procures.'"—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

MR. CALDWELL said that this Bill violated all the other precedents in copyright legislation, and hence they were compelled to move these Amendments. No doubt it would be said that this was a frivolous Amendment, but he maintained that it was absolutely necessary. The words "or procures" were not in any other Copyright Act. The promoters of the Bill, having got a good place in the ballot, evidently thought that they could drive anything through the House as they pleased. It was the promoters themselves who had been the obstructionists. He begged to move.

*MR. WEIR said he hoped the House would accept the Amendment. These words would lead to much trouble and litigation in the future.

Amendment negatived.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In Clause 1, page 1, line 6, after the word 'printed,' to insert the words 'for sale.'"—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Amendment agreed to.

MR CALDWELL said that the words he proposed to leave out were not in the Copyright Act of 1842. They constituted another attempt on the part of the promoters of the Bill to introduce into the measure offences which were not included in that or any Copyright Act. What was the interpretation of the words "carries about"? Suppose a man bought a piece of music, could a policeman seize him, and take it out of his hand on the ground that he was carrying it about? That was to say he was carrying it about in the same sense that he was carrying his pocket handkerchief. But that was not all; this man could be summoned to the police Court, to show cause why the music should not be destroyed, but the magistrate would say "I have nothing to do—the man has lost his piece of music, and I make no order." And no order whatever would be made. It was a very dangerous thing to grant such powers to a body so wealthy as the Musical Copyright Association, which had thousands of pounds at their back.

He had looked through all the Copyright Acts since 1842, and could discover in none of them anything in the nature of "distributing or carrying about." Sub-section 3 covered everything that was necessary to be covered, and Sub-section 2 was therefore obviously not required. It was extremely undesirable that these new offences should be created. It should not be an offence for a man to have a copy for his own personal use. A man who was distributing, but not distributing for sale, was not liable under the present Copyright Acts; and, therefore, he would move the omission of the sub-section.

Amendment proposed—

"In Clause 1, page 1, line 8, to leave out Sub-section (2) of Clause 1."—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Question proposed, "That the words of the sub-section to the word 'or,' in page 1, line 9, stand part of the Bill."

Mr. COURTENAY WARNER (Staffordshire, Lichfield) said he would not follow the example of the hon. Member for South-west Manchester, who spoke for two hours on the Second Reading of the Bill. He thought, after the Bill had been through Grand Committee, that the House should be given some explanation as to why all those Amendments had been accepted. The Amendment was an important one; but he did not agree with his hon. friend the Member for Mid-Lanark in thinking that the Bill was a bad Bill. If, however, the whole of the Bill was to be eliminated, it would be better to drop it altogether. Apparently the promoters did not take any interest in what the Bill was to enact, as long as they had the name of passing it through the House in some shape. The Amendment was an important one; and the promoters ought to explain their attitude regarding it.

Mr. DALZIEL said he regretted that the promoters did not indicate whether they were prepared to accept the Amendment or not. There was a great deal to be said for the Bill; and he regretted that private conference had not saved the House from what had happened to-day. However, the Bill was safe enough, as it was understood the Government would star it. Therefore, they could consider these matters without endangering the Bill. He remembered in the Grand Committee a question of a similar character was debated the whole day, and afterwards accepted. He thought the promoters would be wise to accept the Amendment. The sub-section seemed to show how careful they ought to be in passing this Bill. He confessed he had some sympathy with the promoters; but when the former Bill was passed the music publishers closed their shops for a day in order to allow their assistants to hunt down hawkers. However much that action might have been justified, although it was subsequently not justified in law, they ought to be careful in handing over powers without understanding what they were doing. This sub-section would make it possible for a railway company or a carrying company, such as Carter Paterson, to be made a party to a prosecution because without knowledge they carried pirated music sent by one person to another. The sub-section might be interpreted in two ways; and they knew the sort of people, not very experienced, who would have to interpret it. It was in the interests of all concerned that the law should be perfectly clear.

***Mr. WEIR** said he had been waiting in the hope that the hon. Member for South-west Manchester would accept the Amendment. There were ample powers given to the Publishers' Association in other sub-sections. As his hon. friend had stated, every railway company and carrying company would be liable. They would receive a parcel of music, and for carrying it they would be liable, and involved in litigation. They could stand litigation; but what about the humble individual. A person buying music and having paid for it ought not to be landed in a lawsuit. He was surprised that the promoters of the Bill did not see fit to accept the Amendment.

Captain ELLICE (St Andrews Burghs) said that the sub-section was an entirely new sub-section, which was not to be found in former Copyright Acts. The promoters were acting in the interest of one particular class, and not in the interests of the public. They were told that they should not throw away the baby in the bath; but the promoters had accepted so many Amendments that nothing now remained except dirty water. He would support the Amendment of his hon. friend.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 188; Noes, 66. (Division List No. 145.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex.F.
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Aird, Sir John
Asher, Alexander
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt.Hn. SirH.
Austin, Sir John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barlow, John Emmott
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bignold, Arthur
Bill, Charles
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Boulnois, Edmund
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, T. Gibson (King'sLynn
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Campbell, Rt.Hn.J.A.(Glasgow
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb, Rt.Hn.Sir John C. R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Craig, Charles Curtis(Antrim,S.
Crombie, John William
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Dalkieth, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan)
Denny, Colonel
Dickson, Carles Scott
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dimsdale, Rt.Hn.Sir Joseph C.
Dixon-Hartland, Sir F. Dixon
Dorington, Rt.Hn. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duke, Henry Edward
Dunn, Sir William
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Edwards, Frank
Emmott, Alfred
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fergusson, Rt.Hn.Sir J. (Manc'r
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert Jn
Gore, Hn G.R.C. Ormsby-(Salop
Grant, Corrie
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gunter, Sir Robert
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, Dr. Fredk. R. (Dulwich
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Sir A.(Stafford, W.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hope, J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Howard, Jn.(Kent, Faversham
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hunt, Rowland
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Kennaway, Rt.Hn.Sir John H.
Kimber, Henry
Kitson, Sir James
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Lloyd-George, David
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis(Edinburgh,W
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Maxwell, W.J.H. (Dumfriessh.
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt.Hn.Sir Frederick G.
Milvain, Thomas
Mitchell, Edw.(Fermanagh, N.
Mitchell, William (Burnley)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morpeth, Viscount
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute)
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Nolan, Col. J. P. (Galway, N.)
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, Herb. Pike (Darlington)
Peel, Hn.Wm.Robert Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Price, Robert John
Pym, C. Guy
Rankin, Sir James
Reid, James (Greenock)
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Sandys, Lt.-Col. Thos. Myles
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Seely, Maj.J.E.B.(Isle of Wight
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt.Hn.C.R(Northants
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt.Hn.J.G(Oxf'dUniv.
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomkinson, James
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Wallace, Robert
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Welby, Lt.-Col.A.C.E(Taunton
Whiteley, H.(Ashton und.Lyne
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson J.W.(Worcestersh., N.)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W.H.(Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt.Hn. E.R.(Bath
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Mount and Mr. Galloway.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Ambrose, Robert
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Boland, John
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Burt, Thomas
Cameron, Robert
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, J. Hastings
Elibank, Master of
Fenwick, Charles
Ffrench, Peter
Hammond, John
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Horniman, Frederick John
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones, William(Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kilbride, Denis
Lambert, George
Lundon, W.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid.)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O'Malley, William
Partington, Oswald
Pirie, Duncan V.
Priestley, Arthur
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Robson, William Snowdon
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Sheehy, David
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Thomas, D. Alfred (Merthyr)
Ure, Alexander
Wason, Jn. Cathcart (Orkney)
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Wilson, Chas. Henry (Hull, W.)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Caldwell and Captain Ellice.

MR. CALDWELL said he desired to move in Clause 1, page 1, line 9, to leave out from "sale" to the end of the sub-section. They were new words, and there was no precedent for them in any of the previous Bills on the subject which had been brought in. They did not appear in the Bill which was brought down from the House of Lords, or in the previous Bill introduced by the hon. Member for South-west Manchester. When the hon. Member for South-west Manchester was about to bring in his Bill at the beginning of the session, he said it was substantially in the form to which he himself had agreed in the previous session. Having, however, obtained the benefit of the ballot, the hon. Member did not introduce the Bill in the form in which the hon. Member knew he would accept it. The hon. Member brought in a more drastic Bill. If a private Member loaded his Bill and made it as contentious as he possibly could, simply because he got first place in the ballot, and considered his Bill was through, he made a great mistake. The hon. Member told him after the ballot that he would beat him now.

*__MR. SPEAKER__: I would ask the hon. Member during the few remaining minutes to endeavour to be relevant.

MR. CALDWELL said as he thought that no useful purpose would be served during the next few minutes, he would utilise the time to teach a lesson which might be useful to other promoters. What was the meaning of the words, "purposes of sale" in the sub-section? The hon. Member had taken the words from the Merchandise Marks Act in his endeavour to find the most drastic provisions he possibly could. The House had been given no explanation as to the meaning of the words.

And it being half-past Five of the clock further consideration of the Bill, as amended, stood adjourned.

Bill as amended (by the Standing Committee), to be further considered upon Friday next.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES BILL.

As amended (by the Standing Committee) considered.

MR. BOUSFIELD (Hackney, N.) said that everything contentious had been cut out of the Bill, with the object of securing certain things on which everyone was agreed. The hon. Gentleman for Mid-Lanark had assured him that no objection would be taken to it.

MR. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid.) said that if the Bill were unopposed it could pass on Monday just as well as to-day. He had not yet read the Bill to see that it was all right.

Consideration, as amended (by the Standing Committee), deferred till Friday next.

Adjourned at twenty-six minutes before Six o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Monday, 13*th June*, 1904.

MILITARY MANŒUVRES ACT, 1897.

The King's Answer to the Address of Thursday last, reported by the Lord Steward (*E. Pembroke and Montgomery*) as follows:—"I have received your Address, praying that I will make the Order in Council under the Military Manœuvres Act, 1897, a draft of which was presented to your Lordships' House on the 8th March last. I will comply with your advice."

VISCOUNT DE VESCI.

Ordered, That the Report of the Lord Chancellor of the United Kingdom, made to the House of Lords on Friday last, that the right of the Viscount de Vesci to vote at the elections of representative Peers for Ireland has been established to his satisfaction, be sent to the Clerk of the Crown in Ireland, together with a certificate stating that such Report has been made, and that the House has ordered it to be sent to the said Clerk of the Crown in Ireland.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with:—Local Government Provisional Orders (Gas); Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 6); Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8).

Also the Certificates that no Standing Orders are applicable to the following Bills:—Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 7); Commons Regulation (Merrow) Provisional Order; Commons Regulation (Oxshott) Provisional Order; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 12).

And also the Certificates that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with:—Carlisle Corporation; Lytham Improvement; Radcliffe Tramways and Improvement; London United Tramways; Middlesbrough, Stockton-on-Tees, and Thornaby Tramways; Thames Steamboat Service; Skipton Water River Improvement.

The same were ordered to lie on the Table.

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE.

Report from, That the Standing Orders not complied with in respect of the Tottenham Improvement; Strabane, Raphoe, and Convoy Railway, ought to be dispensed with and Bills allowed to proceed. Read, and agreed to.

Elysée Palace Hotel Company, Limited, Bill [H.L.]. Commons Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway (Various Powers) Bill. Read 2ª, and committed. The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

Trafford Park Bill [H.L.]. Read 3ª, and passed, and sent to the Commons.

London County Council (Money) Bill; London County Council (Tramways and Improvements) Bill. Brought from the Commons; read 1ª; and referred to the Examiners.

St. Marylebone Electric Lighting Bill. Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill. Read 3ª (according to order) with the Amendment, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRADE REPORTS—ANNUAL SERIES.

No. 3183. Portugal (North Portugal).
No. 3184. France (Bordeaux).

SAVINGS BANKS AND FRIENDLY SOCIETIES.

(Post Office Savings Banks Fund)—Account for the year ended 31st December, 1903; (Savings Banks Fund)

an asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

(Friendly Societies Fund)—Accounts for the year ended 20th November, 1903.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

PRIVATE AND PROVISIONAL ORDER CONFIRMATION BILLS.

Ordered, That Standing Orders Nos. 72 and 82 be suspended for the remainder of the session.

THE IRISH LAND PURCHASE ACT.

*Lord CLONBROCK: My Lords, I rise to ask His Majesty's Government whether they are aware that, following the meetings of the United Irish League in East Galway to which their attention has been already called in this House, strikes against payment of rent have taken place in that locality, with the object of compelling landlords to sell their property; and whether, with the view of checking such intimidation, they will refuse to sanction advances for purchase in any districts where it prevails, or take any other steps to prevent it.

In putting this Question, I must refer very briefly to matters which have already been mentioned in your Lordships' House. Just before the House rose for the Whitsuntide recess, my noble friend Lord Westmeath called the attention of the Government to some meetings of the United Irish League, which had taken place in the South and East of Galway, and to some exceedingly inflammatory speeches which had been made at these meetings. I need not again read any extracts from the speeches which my noble friend quoted at the time. It may be sufficient to say that they all pointed much in the same direction—namely, that landlords were to be forced to sell all their property, not only the land in the occupation of the agricultural tenants, but the grazing lands besides, which they either had in their own hands or let to grazing tenants; and, further, that the tenants were not to deal directly with the landlords, but that the landlords were to be forced to sell to the Estates Commissioners. In fact, the landlords were to be given no option in the matter whatever. No overt act of illegality had taken place at that time, but my noble friend judged rightly that it was inevitable that after such speeches something of the kind would occur. His forecast has been completely verified.

A few days after the matter was before your Lordships' House—the following Sunday—a meeting was held in South Galway, where speeches of just the same description were made. There was one speech to which I wish to call your Lordships' attention in view of what took place subsequent to and in pursuance of it. It was a speech made by the Member for the South Division of the county, in which he is reported to have said—

> "They all thought the Act a splendid Act, but they might as well expect a flock of blackbirds to give the people the land as expect the landlords to sell unless compelled by the determination of the people and by their organisation. I am glad that you are asked in the resolution not to buy, but by agitation to compel them to divide the grass land wherever an estate is offered—not to buy unless the grass land is divided among the whole body of tenants."

Two or three days later rent-day occurred on three properties immediately adjoining. On the first property the tenants appeared, headed by the very Gentleman who made this speech, who asked to be allowed to state the case for the tenants. He began by speaking very handsomely of the good and harmonious relations that always existed between the landlord and the tenants on that property, but he wound up by demanding that the landlord should make over the whole of his property, grass lands and all, to the Estates Commissioners, who would then proceed to divide it among the tenants, or in default of that he demanded that the landlord should give a substantial abatement of the rent then due. The landlord refused to accept either of these alternatives. The tenants withdrew to consult, and finally a deputation waited upon the landlord and asked for an abatement of 4s. in the pound, and on that being refused they all left and declined to pay any rent whatever.

On another property adjoining, the tenants arrived accompanied by the chairman of the meeting to which I have referred. The landlord objected to this gentleman acting as spokesman, preferring apparently to deal with the tenants directly, and upon this they all left in a body and refused to pay any rent whatever. On the third property, which it appears had not attracted the attention of the United Irish League, the tenants came by themselves and all paid their rent. This is a distinct proof that the tenants in the other two cases were not acting on their own initiative, but under the influence of the League. It may be said that these are poor, ignorant people, and that they require some man of considerable education to put the case for them. Anyone who has much acquaintance with this class in Ireland knows that they are thoroughly capable of expressing their opinions and are remarkably keen hands at a bargain calculated to ensure success in life. In whatever other quality they may be deficient, it most certainly is not in astuteness or fluency of expression. It is, therefore, clear that these leaders attended, not for the purpose of explaining the case, but in order to keep the tenants in line and to see that they thoroughly obeyed the mandate of the League.

It may be thought curious in this country that men whom I have described as intelligent and astute should submit to such dictation, but those who make that objection know very little of the terrible power of an organisation such as that in Ireland, and the unscrupulous way in which its decrees are enforced. I will give an instance of a small property not far from my own home. It consists of a demesne, and some agricultural tenancies surround it. It is in the hands of trustees. Some time ago the tenants made an informal proposition to buy. They offered some very inadequate sum—I think fourteen years purchase—but they imposed the condition that the demesne should be split up and divided among them. The negotiations never went further, there being legal difficulties in the way, and the trustees having no power to sell; but the tenants were given to understand that such terms as they proposed were not likely to be accepted. Up to that time it had been the custom to let the demesne for grazing purposes to the surrounding farmers. An order was at once given that this was to be stopped. No one was to send cattle on to this demesne, and it was strictly boycotted. It remained derelict for some time, and finally was let to a farmer in the neighbourhood, one of the very few men who had got independence enough to stand out against the League. Well, what happened? This farmer was boycotted and threatened, and only a few weeks ago received a threatening letter ordering him to surrender the farm, and informing him that if he did not, there was plenty of powder and ball in the county to make him do so. On the occasion of an absolute fuel famine last winter, the agent told the tenants they might go and get the timber, of which a good deal was lying about in the demesne, the windfalls of the great storm of last year, and take it away for nothing, but they were afraid to do it, and preferred to go some distance away and buy fuel rather than get timber from this demesne for nothing. One of them had asked for help to repair his house, and the agent gave him an order on the steward for timber, but he was afraid to present it. It is clear that all this boycotting did not come from the tenants themselves, who would have been very pleased to forget all about it when they wanted fuel. It must have been done by superior order.

I think I have said enough to show your Lordships the tyranny exercised in Ireland by this League, and that it is impossible where this agitation exists that that freedom of contract can be maintained which exists in every civilised country. Further it is a source of considerable danger to the peace and prosperity of the country, for in cases where there has been an absolute strike against the payment of rent it is obvious that the landlord must adopt the only course open to him and take legal proceedings against his tenants. This has already begun. The result is that we shall have the old story of the land war and the plan of campaign, of which everyone in Ireland retains such vivid and painful recollection. Now if His Majesty's Government are content to sit with folded hands and serenely contemplate from an Olympian height the battle raving beneath them, contenting themselves only with expressions of stern disapproval of such illegality, and taking no active steps to restore tranquillity, the impression which unfortunately is now whispered about will be confirmed and strengthened, that His Majesty's Government are so bent on the success of the Act of last year, so anxious for the transfer of land from landlord to tenant, that they are not disposed to look too curiously into the means by which that transfer is brought about. That is not my opinion. I hold a diametrically opposite view. I am convinced that His Majesty's Government look upon intimidation and all other illegal actions with the abhorrence which it excites in every right-minded man; but I quote this to show the feeling of uncertainty and anxiety existing in the country owing to the agitation and the absence of any steps to check it. I think too that they must see the injurious effect, although I hardly think they recognise the extent of the injury, the absolutely paralyzing effect of such agitation on the working of the Purchase Act.

I would, therefore, ask His Majesty's Government, if they are not prepared to take any stronger steps, whether they will not refuse to sanction any agreements for purchase in districts where such intimidation prevails. It may seem at first sight a somewhat incongruous proposition to recommend the suspension of an Act of Parliament with a view to promoting its efficient working. But there are two things to be considered. There is the change in the tenure of land in Ireland and there is the suppression and prevention of illegality. The change in the tenure of land may be a matter of great public importance, but surely the prevention of illegality must come first. I am sure that is the view of His Majesty's Government. If that were not the case, undoubtedly the impression to which I have just alluded would be indeed confirmed that they were looking to the end rather than the means, and were conniving at agitation.

But I wish to point out that the step I suggest would not materially affect the progress of the Act. The districts affected are at present restricted in area, I am thankful to say, and few in number. How much this number may be increased or the area enlarged if the agitation is allowed to continue is a question which the future only can solve, but at present they are restricted both in area and in number. Well, in these districts there is a deadlock already. The Act is a dead letter, for it is quite clear that the majority of the landlords would be prepared to face all obloquy, annoyance, and even personal danger, rather than submit to terms which must be ruinous to the interests both of themselves and their families. It may be said that even in these districts there might be a property in respect of which a perfectly voluntary arrangement might be come to. It is hardly possible that in such a district there could be a property not directly or indirectly influenced by agitation. But even supposing that such a highly favoured spot should exist, a sort of peaceful oasis, an "island valley of Avilion," sheltered in some mysterious manner from the surrounding tempest, and against which the storms of the United League beat in vain, the worst that could happen would be that the conclusion of the arrangements would be postponed. And it need not be postponed for long, for if the agitators and their followers and dupes found that nothing could be gained by agitation, but that actual loss would be incurred by the refusal of the Government to make any advances for purchase, the agitation would subside, and the country would be restored to a normal state of tranquillity.

If His Majesty's Government will not adopt that suggestion, let them take some other active steps to show that they are determined that the freedom of contract which ought to exist shall be maintained and that the Act which they brought in, in the hope that it would be an advantage and be acceptable to all, shall not be turned into an engine of oppression. At the risk of wearying your Lordships I must say one word on behalf of the landlords. I must repeat what we have often urged, and has never been controverted. Landlords are under no moral obligation to sell. They are not responsible for the state of confusion, of uncertainty and anxiety brought about by faulty legislation in the past. All that they can be accused of is the apparently unpardonable crime of still being possessed of some property which is coveted by others. If, however, the landlords are prepared to fall in with the views of the Government and to transfer to their tenants the remnant of their inheritance, the least they can expect is that they shall have a free hand in so doing, and shall not be starved into submission by the United Irish League.

LORD BARRYMORE: My Lords, before the noble Lord replies on behalf of the Government, I should like to state that, though the Question of my noble friend refers entirely to the County of Galway, there are other parts of Ireland where the same attempts to compel landlords to sell by withholding payments of rent are taking place. It is within your Lordships' recollection that a very few weeks ago the noble Earl opposite, the Earl of Cork, described what was taking place on an estate of his in the immediate neighbourhood of Cork, where meetings had been held and violence used, and where the condition of things was exceedingly bad. Since then, I believe, that case has been settled on a purchase basis, but there are a great many other cases besides that one. I know of two recent ones in the East of the county of Limerick, and I also know of three cases where this has been going on during the past eighteen months in the west portion of the county of Limerick, adjoining the county of Kerry. I know of a case, almost in the west centre of the county of Cork, where the tenants on an estate which formerly belonged to a distinguished Member of your Lordships' House and which was purchased by another gentleman, refused last winter to pay any rent unless the present owner was prepared to sell at what he considered a ruinous sacrifice. Meetings were held, and he was denounced for declining to part with what was his own upon terms which he could not in justice to himself and to those who were joint owners in the estate regard as just and fair.

Then there is another case at the present moment in the West of the county, where the sheriff has already been defied, and where a very serious state of things is likely to result unless some very strong measures are taken by His Majesty's Government. There is a further case in the East Riding of Cork, where the tenants last year refused to pay their rent, telling the landlord that he must sell to them at exceedingly low terms. No rent has been paid for twelve months, and meetings have been held in the neighbourhood. Cattle were ultimately taken, some belonging to a Member of Parliament, and were sold in Cork by the sheriff. A meeting was afterwards held in the immediate vicinity, which was addressed by another Member of Parliament and at which the sheriff and the landlord were denounced. That portion of the fight has been concluded; but, notwithstanding that, the tenants on the rest of the estate have not paid for twelve months, and it is feared that serious consequences may result. This is a state of things which everyone who is interested in the peace of Ireland must most sincerely and deeply deplore. I am sure no one in your Lordships' House, and no man who owns property in Ireland is anxious to see another land war in that country.

The great Purchase Act passed last year by His Majesty's Government will, I believe, if given time, work satisfactorily and carry out the policy of the Government to a very large extent; but if attempts are to be made to force landlords to sell by illegal methods such as I have described it is impossible that the Act can work. The effect of its operation will undoubtedly be checked; we shall have a fresh land war, and sales, instead of taking place rapidly, will certainly be retarded, if not stopped. For the working of that Act time and patience are no doubt required. Negotiations cannot be carried out all at the moment, and I think that probably the Estates Commissioners will require a larger staff than they at present have if they are to perform the work which is required of them in a short time. I sincerely hope His Majesty's Government will do what they can to stop the illegal and violent methods which are being resorted to to force sales under the Act, for they will not only lead to grave disturbances throughout the country but retard the working of the Act itself.

*THE LORD CHANCELLOR OF IRELAND (Lord ASHBOURNE): My Lords, my noble friend Lord Clonbrock, who has introduced this subject, is entitled to speak with great authority on any question of this kind. He is identified by property and residence with that part of Ireland to which he has addressed himself, and there is no one in your Lordships' House who has sought to make himself more closely acquainted with everything that goes on there than my noble friend. My noble friend has very fairly prefaced his remarks by alluding to the occasions upon which topics of a similar character have been presented to your Lordships this session, and has mentioned what occurred on the occasion when my noble friend Lord Westmeath brought the matter under the attention of your Lordships last month. I am glad my noble friend said he did not for a moment think that the Government intended to regard this question calmly or with serenity from lofty heights. My noble friend who last spoke mentioned a different part of the country with which he is much more familiar, and spoke of instances occurring there which have attracted his attention and have also found their way into the Press.

I need hardly say that the question raised is one of importance, and that no Government would be justified in putting it aside as unworthy of close attention and examination. The particular matter that Lord Clonbrock brought forward had reference to a part of Connaught; my noble friend mentioned what occurred on some estates there, and also indicated what he thought might be a possible remedy. It is difficult to get any precise information as to the details of payment of rent on certain estates. Sometimes the tenants do not like to give it, and sometimes the landlords do not care to give it. I do not think it would be quite accurate to speak of strikes against the payment of rent. But unquestionably there have been refusals to pay rent on some estates, and landlords are sure to commence legal proceedings for their recovery; and if these proceedings result in decisions and decrees in favour of the landlords the Government, of course, will be bound to protect them in enforcing the awards of the law. Any attempt to compel landowners to sell by refusing to pay rent would be an endeavour to make the Act of 1903 compulsory, and would be open to the very gravest objection.

I think my noble friend was right in putting in the forefront of his observations the fact that the Purchase Act was a voluntary and not a compulsory Act. That is the only way in which it can be rightly regarded. It must be borne in mind that it is not an Act to be worked by coercion or undue pressure, but by the voluntary principle. The tenants are not compelled to buy; they can, if they please, remain tenants with all their rights and privileges under the existing Land Code. The landlords, on the other hand, cannot be compelled to sell, and they must not be forced to do so by threats or any form of intimidation. I am only saying what has been said abundantly in reference to the intentions of the framers of this Act, and what is its manifest and obvious construction. If any overt act should be discovered, capable of proof, showing that any criminal act has been committed, the Excutive will not fail to act promptly and with firmness. The attention of His Majesty's Government is steadily directed to the question, and they have no intention whatever of forgetting their duty. This fact has been mentioned twice by my noble friend Lord Denbigh, who spoke on former occasions on behalf of the Government; and as recently as 19th May last he said that the Government would be prepared to take all measures necessary for the purpose of protecting life and property, and for the purpose of enforcing the law. I hope that that statement, repeated now, will indicate that the Government have up to this date had their attention steadily and firmly directed to this question, that they recognise their duty, and have no intention of faltering in its discharge.

The noble Lord who called attention to this question asked whether, with the view of checking intimidation, His Majesty's Government would refuse to sanction advances for purchase in any districts where it prevails. My noble friend put that temperately and tentatively, but it was obvious that he himself saw the immense difficulties that lay in the way of carrying it out. In my opinion it would be impossible, and, I think, it would be illegal. The Act of last year is the law of the land. Its provisions are open to all, and persons who are in a position to invoke its provisions on their behalf with perfectly honest agreements between landlord and tenant should be able to do so. It would not be possible to suspend the Act in those districts and refuse to administrate a law which is on the Statute-book. In saying this I am saying what I have no doubt my noble friend anticipated. I assume that what he had in his mind was whether there were not some means by which those who were parties to this undue pressure might be made to recognise that they were defeating instead of advancing their interests. I am by no means sure that illegitimate pressure by tenants on the tenanted portion of an estate, to force the sale and division of untenanted land would not be a matter which the Commissioners would take into account in considering the circumstances of the case. Like the Congested Districts Board, it might be their duty not to sanction such sales if forced by illegal pressure. I believe that in the administration of the Congested Districts Board there are close inquiries in order to see that the proposals that are made for the sale of estates are free on both sides. I hope I have said enough to indicate that the Government are alive to the importance of the topics to which my noble friends have referred, and that they are not at all insensible to their duty in the matter.

*THE EARL OF WESTMEATH: My Lords, I do not wish to trouble your Lordships at any length to-day, as I ventured to put several Questions on this subject to the Government the other day. The Questions that I then put still remain unanswered. The reply, if I can call it such, which I received from the noble Lord on behalf of the Government did not deal with any of the points I raised. For instance, Lord Denbigh on that occasion went out of his way to quote an interesting and laudable speech by an Archbishop in an entirely different part of the country, which had nothing whatever to do with the point I brought forward. If any of your Lordships take the opportunity to read the Irish papers you will find that the occasions on which we bring forward our grievances in the House of Lords are always followed by articles showing the greatest depression and the greatest discouragement. We always obtain the same answer. The noble and learned Lord who has replied for the Government to-day, although he used language with somewhat flowery adornment, has given us the same answer that we always receive. We are told that the Government is watching what is going on, and that if only we will tell them of anything wrong they will take steps to remedy it. That is the answer we always receive. I think we have taken some trouble lately, by quoting speeches which are being made all over Ireland, to demonstrate what is taking place. My noble friend Lord Clonbrock has this afternoon shown His Majesty's Government that following on these speeches acts of the greatest illegality have taken place and are taking place. It is illegal not to pay rent, and there is now in the very districts to which I referred the other day a regular campaign and an absolute and definite repudiation of the payment of rents. The Irish newspapers are full of these facts.

I do not know what more the noble and learned Lord wants than an absolute refusal to pay rent. Think of the position of the poor landlord in some parts of the West of Ireland. He is put to great trouble and expense; he has heavy charges to meet; he is not at all ready to enter into a prolonged fight against his enemies; the odds are ten to one he may have to give in, and he sells his land at a price which will hardly pay the charges on his property. Do people in this country know, when they see the returns of sales which have actually taken place, how many of those sales are brought about by pressure? Or do they imagine that they are all voluntary? I confess I should like to hear the views of the noble Marquess the Foreign Minister on this subject, not only as Leader of this House, but also as one of the members of the Treasury Bench who from his position as a great Irish landlord himself must be acquainted as well as we are with everything that is going on. He must know that the answer which the noble and learned Lord has given to-night will be received to-morrow in the Irish Press with ridicule and contempt on the one side and with discouragement and disappointment on the other.

I venture to ask the noble Marquess if he will take steps to try and make clear to these agitators all over the country that they will gain nothing by carrying on their present programme. I do not know if it would be illegal, as the noble and learned Lord seemed to suggest, to suspend the Act in cases where intimidation has taken place; but in cases where we can show that speeches of the most menacing character have been delivered and that these have been followed by such illegal acts as the complete stoppage of rent, and where this again has been followed by the collapse of the opposition of the landlord and by his being forced to sell his land at a price which will not only not pay him, but will induce his neighbours in the long run to do the same—if this can be definitely shown, I think we are entitled to claim that the Act, instead of being a boon, as it might be, will be the greatest curse; and if it cannot be shown that such a course would be illegal, I think we are entitled to ask that the Act should be suspended in such cases, and that landlord and tenant alike should be deprived of advantages which might be conferred under happier circumstances.

LORD ORANMORE AND BROWNE: My Lords, so far the great Act which was passed last year has not been the success its promoters wished it to be. Landlords, although they are not anxious to sell their property, are yet ready to part with the tenanted portion of it if they can obtain a price they consider reasonable. The tenants, on the other hand, profess to be ready to buy, but they are not so far ready to give a price at which landlords can sell. If matters remained there, I think they would find their own solution. If the tenants were anxious to buy, their offer would increase; on the other hand, if landlords found they were in want of hard cash, they would be obliged to make some further sacrifices in order to obtain it. But the case is an entirely different one when an outside agency steps in, and when that agency is the United Irish League.

Noble Lords who have spoken have pointed out what the effect will be on impoverished landlords of refusal to pay rent; but I would call your Lordships' attention more especially to another matter which prevents the Act from working, and that is the determination which is evinced not to purchase holdings unless the landlord is prepared to sell what the tenants are pleased to call his grazing ranches. County councils, district councils, local newspapers, village agitators, all insist on this. And what are these grazing ranches? Grass land on which the landlords have spent large sums of money in drainage and in various improvements. These are the lands on which cattle are fed—those cattle which are one of the most valuable assets we have in the West of Ireland. Everybody is agreed that it is desirable that landlords should remain in Ireland, that they should remain there to spend at least the interest of the money they receive for the sale of their tenanted lands, and not only that, but, if the country is quiet, that they should invest a portion of the principal in the development of their native land. But you cannot expect men to live in a country if they have no inducement to live there, and if you take away all their grass lands you take away from the landlords every inducement to remain there. I am quite certain that unless His Majesty's Government adopt a firm attitude in suppressing any attempts to compel landlords to part with their untenanted land the Act of last year will remain a dead letter in those portions of Ireland where it would do the greatest good.

THE EARL OF ARRAN: My Lords, I think hardly anyone in England at the present moment realises how serious a future is threatened for Ireland. The Land Act of 1903 was introduced with the object of being the instrument of peace in Ireland, but I greatly fear it shows that it may be instead the foundation of war and of another land campaign. The spirit of compulsion to which my noble friend Lord Clonbrock has already alluded, is not, unfortunately, merely local. It shows signs of spreading to other parts of Ireland, and how far it will spread depends on the attitude that is taken up by His Majesty's Government. The reply that the noble and learned Lord has given will be read with the greatest interest by everyone in Ireland. There is, as Lord Clonbrock has said, a feeling amongst the Nationalist and tenant Party that they may act with impunity. The noble and learned Lord has said that if we point out any illegal action His Majesty's Government will at once take measures for its suppression. I venture to submit that the facts and instances which have been brought forward to-day by Lord Clonbrock show the existence of illegalities, and I hope that not only assertions of disapproval will be given, but active steps taken to prevent a repetition of such illegal acts. Otherwise the spirit of compulsion and illegal agitation will spread every day and become stronger. I hope we may hear that strong steps will be taken, otherwise the Land Act will become, not an instrument of peace, but an instrument of war

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (The Marquess of LANSDOWNE): My Lords, I understood the noble Lord who spoke from the BackBench (the Earl of Westmeath) to complain of the answer of my noble and learned friend beside me on the ground that it did not give to your Lordships a sufficient assurance as to the attitude which His Majesty's Government intend to assume towards these combinations in Ireland. I cannot help thinking that the noble Earl scarcely followed as closely as he might the reply of my noble and learned friend, or fully realised the import of his words. For, my Lords, what was the position which the noble and learned Lord took up? He reminded your Lordships that the Purchase Act of last year was in its essence a voluntary Act—voluntary both as regards landlord and tenant; and he pointed out that, that being so, any attempt to bring about sales by means of coercion was necessarily illegal. The noble and learned Lord also pointed out that in those cases in which the landlord resorts to civil remedies in order to compel the payment of the rent which is due to him, the landlord will, provided, of course, he is able to satisfy the Courts that his claim is a good one, receive the support of the Government, and that his representatives will be given the protection to which they are entitled at the hands of the Government.

Then there is the further case in which the difficulty arises, not out of the application of the civil law, but in consequence of criminal acts. In regard to those cases the noble and learned Lord explained that whenever any overt act of a criminal kind was committed the Irish Government were fully prepared to deal with it. Does the noble Earl behind me expect us to state here which are the cases in which it may or may not be possible to invoke the aid of the law in a particular manner? My noble friend Lord Barrymore mentioned to your Lordships a number of cases in which there had been combinations to resist the payment of rent in order to coerce the landlord into purchase. Obviously it is not in our power in this House to say which of those are cases in which a particular remedy can be applied.

It struck me, listening to this discussion, that the remarks made by noble Lords from Ireland, while no doubt they portray faithfully the unfortunate state of things which exists in some parts of that country, do not afford us very much help or suggestion as to the most appropriate means of dealing with the difficulty. For, my Lords, what is the only suggestion which has been made to us to-night? It is that in districts where these combinations have taken place the Government should refuse to sanction any advances for purchase. That, surely, if interpreted according to the obvious meaning of the words, is a suggestion which on the face of it we can scarcely be expected to regard with favour. For what does it come to? It comes to this—that in a particular district where, let us say, half the estates are the theatre of these operations and the other half are not, the law-abiding and well-conducted tenants on those estates, where rent has been punctually paid, are to be debarred from the great privilege conferred upon them by the Act of last year in order that they may suffer vicariously for the misdoings of their neighbours on the other estates in that district. That seems to me to be a suggestion which savours of considerable injustice, and which the Government can scarcely regard as a very practical guide. But if the noble Lord merely intended that, where on a particular estate or estates it can be shown that an agreement for sale has been the result of conspiracy or of coercive action on the part of the tenants, in those cases the sale shall not be allowed to proceed, then I think what the noble and learned Lord said ought to satisfy him, because I understood the Lord Chancellor of Ireland to say that, in his opinion, the Courts can, under the existing law, withhold their consent to a sale if it is established to their satisfaction that the agreement for sale has been brought about by illegal methods. And the noble and learned Lord went on to say that a discretion of that kind was actually exercised by the Congested Districts Board. Up to that point I think the principle which the noble Lord who spoke first advocated is reasonable enough, but if it be further extended, then I must say it seems to me to be a most inequitable one. I think what has been said by my noble and learned friend should be enough to show your Lordships that we regard this matter as one of very serious importance, and that we are very far indeed from adopting towards it that attitude of Olympian indifference which was attributed to us by my noble friend behind me.

THE IMPERIAL YEOMANRY.

Lord LOVAT, who had given notice "To call the attention of the House to the defects of equipment, training, and organisation of the third branch of the Auxiliary Forces, the Imperial Yeomanry," said: I wish your Lordships to consider whether the Yeomanry, as at present constituted, is ready to take its part as a fighting force in defence of the Empire. From the fact that His Majesty's Government did not include the Yeomanry in their reference to the Commission on the Auxiliary Forces, I think it is fair to draw the inference that the Government do not appreciate the grave state in which that force is. The present moment is, I think, a suitable one for the discussion of this matter. There is shortly to be an important debate on the subject of the Auxiliary Forces generally, and I think this discussion to-day may lead to suggestions being brought forward which will be of value in the consideration of the general subject. I do not propose to discuss questions which affect only individual regiments or districts, but shall confine my remarks to those points which affect the Yeomanry as a whole. I would like, with your Lordships' permission, to read two statements which appear in the Report of the Duke of Norfolk's Commission. The first is—

> "We are agreed in the conclusion that the Volunteer Force, in view of the unequal military education of the officers, the limited training of the men, and the defects of equipment and organisation, is not qualified to take the field against a Regular Army."

The second statement is—

> "We are forced to the conclusion that the Militia, in its existing condition, is unfit to take the field in the defence of the country. We think, however, that these defects arise from causes beyond the control of the officers and men."

I will not go into that matter further, beyond observing that these extracts are not without their significance.

I venture to say that the Yeomanry are by no means ready as a fighting machine. In the first place, the force is not armed. Those regiments that have swords issued to them have not enough to go round, and the great majority of Yeoman have no weapon beyond the rifle. I do not think I need dwell upon the necessity of a steel weapon of some kind in defence. All the mounted troops in Europe possess such an arm, and I do not see why the Yeomanry should be the only force without it. The musketry of the Yeomanry, judged by the Returns, is no better than that of the Volunteers, and, owing to our system of instruction, there is little hope of improvement. In the Yeomanry Regulations it is laid down that every officer, before rising to the next rank, must qualify in a course of musketry; but on looking through the Army List I find that over half the regiments of the Imperial Yeomanry contain only one officer, or have no officer, who has been through the higher course. We all know the indifference in the Cavalry on the question of musketry, and as these men are now the only instructors who instruct the Yeomanry squadrons it is not possible, under the present arrangements, that these squadrons will ever reach any high standard of efficiency in musketry. There is at present no method for training the senior officers of the Yeomanry. If they go to a school they are put in the same class as subalterns, and are taught in exactly the same way. They have also the power, it is true, of being attached to cavalry regiments, but I think any cavalry soldier will know exactly the amount of instruction which, under existing circumstances, they are likely to get there, or the chance they will have of handling troops.

Another weakness is in organisation. I am not to-night going into the question of mobilisation, or into the question as to who are to command various units. I understand that the War Office have some scheme on this subject which is shortly to be made public. But on the question of organisation I think it is fair to offer criticism at the present moment. Just as companies constitute regiments so, in time of war, regiments will have to be made up to constitute brigades. Now, who are going to act as commanders? I do not ask for individual names, but what class of officer is he going to be? Is the officer who is to command a Yeomanry brigade to be a Yeoman? I do not think that is possible. Or is he going to be a cavalry officer? There are great difficulties in the way of his being a cavalry officer. The cavalry drill and the Yeomanry drill are two distinctly different things, and, moreover, there are no means, at the present moment, of getting the necessary connection between those who understand cavalry drill and those who understand Yeomanry drill, because both of the books are out of print. A cavalry officer, accustomed to command a smart regiment or brigade in which a certain depth is occupied, will not be able to handle efficiently a brigade where the extent of ground covered and the time taken in manœuvres are entirely different. If a cavalry leader takes over a Yeomanry brigade at once, he will require a considerable period in order to get full work out of that brigade, and to find out what his Yeomanry officers know, and, still more, what they do not know. We have heard nothing about this question having been considered, and no steps have been taken to put commanding officers of Yeomanry in touch with officers commanding brigades.

On the question of staff, I think it will be admitted that the condition of the Yeomanry is even worse. The fifty-six regiments will, no doubt, be divided into eighteen brigades, but you will want considerably more than eighteen staff officers to run those brigades. The more untrained the units the better trained your staff officer must be Now, where are the staff officers to come from for the Yeomanry brigades if we went to war to-morrow? In the Army List you will find two lists of qualified staff officers—the first is a list of those who have passed the Staff College, and the second a list of those who are qualified for staff duties. You will no doubt expect cavalry officers to do the staff work of the Cavalry; yet if you look through the List from end to end you will find only one man. I do not speak of those who are at present occupying other posts. I only refer to those of major and captain rank. If you have not got cavalry officers, what other officers will you have to command your brigades? Will you have Yeomanry officers? Your difficulty in not having any instruction for senior Yeomanry officers comes in there; and, if you mobilise to-morrow, is it likely that the various commanders of regiments would hand over their best officers to run a brigade for any man, especially for a General they did not know?

I come now to the question of signalling. We in the Yeomanry are supposed to be the advance guard, the scouts of the Army, and, as is well known, it is not only necessary for men in the advance guard to get information; the next thing must necessarily be the rapid transmission of it. Yet what do we see in the matter of the training of the Yeomanry force in signalling? At the present moment there is not one regiment in the whole force qualified for signalling. Therefore, however good the work they may do in front may be, it is totally lost because they are unable to transmit it. Again, in the matter of transport, things are even worse. I will take the Northern District. In Scotland there are 100 battalions of Volunteers, Militia, and Regulars. There are there exactly two transport companies. Is it likely that they are going to give the whole of those two companies to the Yeomanry? I do not think that is in the least probable. So far as I can make out, there is not one single officer who has got a certificate for any knowledge of transport; and you have got no qualified wheelwrights or saddlers, for the reason that you do not pay them. If they do exist in certain regiments it is by fortuitous chance and not as the result of the action of the authorities. This fact, if it does not disqualify the Yeomanry, at any rate limits the good the force can do in the field.

I can assure your Lordships that I am very far from taking a pessimistic view of the Yeomanry as a whole. I regard the force, if properly worked, as capable of being made a most efficient body. It only requires a little thought at the War Office, and, what is more necessary, action there, to get over most of these difficulties. I do not think we are asking too much. At present, Yeomanry officers, when they go for a musketry course to Hythe, have a week's instruction in Maxims and other things they will probably have nothing whatever to do with afterwards. Why not have a division of the course, and make short courses locally for musketry, with the longer course at Hythe for those who wish it? We really must have some course of instruction specially for senior Yeomanry officers, and one for junior officers. In no school are scholars in the sixth standard taught in the same class as those in the first standard; yet this is what takes place at present in regard to the instruction of Yeomanry officers. As to the question of brigadiers, I do not ask that they should be appointed at once, but I think they might be provisionally appointed. Commanding officers would then know who they would have to command them, and would be able to find out their views on the different subjects that crop up.

With little difficulty, again, the signalling could be made efficient. The total grant, if the signallers are qualified, is the princely sum of £12. This is a sample of the help which the War Office gives to commanding officers to assist them in making their units efficient in signalling. The solution with regard to transport is so obvious that I will not dilate upon it. There ought to be some method of paying wheelwrights and saddlers and men who are essential to running transport. In the South African War a number of officers paid wheelwrights and saddlers themselves because it was absolutely necessary to have with them men able to do the small jobs which always crop up in a campaign. The Yeomanry are far from being in a satisfactory condition at the present moment. I do not speak as regards units, but the whole Yeomanry as a fighting force; and, when appealing to His Majesty's Government to meet the Yeomanry in some form, I would ask them not to rush into reforms as rapidly as they are in the habit of doing, but, in consultation with the senior Yeomanry officers, to go thoroughly into the matter.

Earl ROBERTS: My Lords, I do not intend to take up your Lordships' time by any lengthy remarks this evening, because I understand there are some officers directly associated with the Yeomanry who desire to speak on this occasion. I would only like to refer to a few of the points which my noble and gallant friend Lord Lovat has brought forward. In regard to musketry, I cannot lay too great a stress on the necessity for every branch of the military service being experts in musketry. It is just as necessary for the Yeomany as it is for the Infantry soldier, and I can quite understand the difficulty which Lord Lovat points out which arises from the want of sufficient instructors. If musketry in a regiment is to be learnt satisfactorily the officers must take the lead. They must themselves understand how to teach their men.

There is no doubt that it is difficult in Yeomanry regiments, especially like Lord Lovat's, which is scattered in the North of Scotland, for the officers to come all the way down to Hythe to get a musketry certificate. I am sure that when this matter is brought to their notice, the War Office will endeavour to meet that difficulty by making some arrangement by which perhaps a less decided certificate can be given to officers for a course sufficiently long to enable them to train their men at some local range under local conditions? It is hardly to be expected that a sufficient number of officers can come all the way from the North of Scotland to the south of England to go through a musketry course, but at the same time it is absolutely essential, if the men are to be expert in musketry, that their officers should know how to teach them. With regard to the weapon, it has been thought necessary that every soldier should have some weapon with which to defend himself. The rifle is his first weapon, but he must have something besides. It was decided, wisely as I think, that the Yeomanry should not be armed with the sword, but with something else, and the only other weapon at present available is the bayonet. I cannot remember how it was—and I failed to get the information at the War Office to-day—that the bayonet was not given to the Yeomanry. The question was discussed, but there is no record showing exactly how it was that the distribution was stopped. That is, however, another suggestion to which I think the War Office will be sure to respond when it is called to their attention. I do not for a moment hold a brief for the War Office, but I am sure that my noble friend the Under-Secretary will give satisfactory answers on the several points which the noble and gallant Lord has brought forward. All I would say is that the Yeomanry is a service which is well worthy of encouragement, and of every effort to make it efficient. In future wars we shall require more mounted men to do the work than have hitherto been the case, and the Yeomanry is the force I look forward to as the body which will be in England to take the part of the mounted troops abroad. Everything, therefore, I hope will be done to encourage the Yeomanry and to meet their wishes as far as the financial difficulties can be overcome.

*THE MARQUESS OF WINCHESTER: My Lords, I wish to associate myself with the remarks which have fallen from the noble and gallant Field-Marshal, and also with what was said by the noble and gallant Lord opposite. Although musketry is, perhaps, the most important part of our defensive armour, no changes whatever have been made in the way in which Yeomen obtain their instruction in musketry. The same system obtains to-day as when the men were attested under the Volunteer Act. For instance, although a Yeoman is a Militiaman to all intents and purposes, it was with some difficulty that I obtained permission for my troop to use the Government ranges and this stipulation was added, that I should not only pay for the canvas of the targets but should employ the Government markers and not be permitted to put my own men in the butts. I contend that not only should ranges be provided by the Government, but also markers. There is another matter in which a more sympathetic attitude might be shown, and that is in the choice of inspecting officers. I know a case of a regiment this year which was inspected by an ex-cavalry captain whose name does not and has not for the past fifteen years appeared in the Army List. This can hardly be taken as a compliment to a Yeomanry regiment in which were serving officers who had seen a considerable amount of service in the Regular Army. Last year the regiment to which I have the honour to belong was inspected by the present Inspector-General of Cavalry, and that inspection did the regiment more good than any five inspections it had had before. And for this reason. Not only did the Inspector-General take the officers into his confidence, but he took the men also. He called up each Group Leader and pointed out their faults in a most sympathetic manner. That, I consider, is something like what an inspection of a Yeomanry regiment should be. It should have for its object the promotion of the highest possible efficiency in each particular unit.

There is another matter to which I should like to draw the attention of His Majesty's Government — namely, the period of re-attestment. It seems to me rather hard that after a man has served his first three years he should be asked to re-attest for another three years. There may be excellent reasons for that, but I cannot help feeling that we should retain a larger proportion of our older men, who are so necessary to a regiment, if the period of re-attestment was made from year to year after the first period of service had expired. The Yeomanry service would gain considerably by such a change. His Majesty's Government would also do well to thoroughly consider what has been said in regard to the question of signalling. There are in most regiments a very keen lot of young fellows ready to take up signalling and do their best to perfect themselves in it; but in order to obtain the Government grant you must, I think, have fifteen men who are thoroughly trained, and it is necessary for them to go through a three months course. It is quite impossible to obtain the number of men in any Yeomanry regiment who are able to give up that amount of time. I think that for the Yeomanry a more simple system of signalling might be adopted. I do not wish that it should be taken from any of my remarks that I am not deeply sensible of the immense amount the War Office has already done for the Yeomanry service, but I do appeal to them to further encourage the men in the great interest which they now take in the force.

*LORD HARRIS: My Lords, I take the opportunity of congratulating my noble and gallant friend opposite on having brought this subject forward, independent of any more elaborate discussion upon the Report of the Duke of Norfolk's Commission. I am glad, however, that I am not able to take the altogether pessimistic view that my noble friend does of the Yeomanry force. In the first place, I do not understand why he should have relegated it to the low grade he has done. He refers to it as the "third branch" of the Auxiliary forces. My impression is that the Imperial Yeomanry are now Militia, and are, therefore, the first branch; at any rate, they always were the second. The noble and gallant Lord has pointed out—and I am quite certain the noble Earl the Under-Secretary of State for War is only too grateful to those of us who belong to the Imperial Yeomanry for any suggestions we can give him—various directions in which it is possible to help us. My own idea is this, that what has got to be kept in view is not whether the force is competent for the defence of the Empire, as my noble and gallant friend opposite said, because the Yeomanry as a force is not intended for the defence of the Empire, but whether it is competent for the defence of these Islands.

It is reasonable to ask His Majesty's Government to put us in the position where we should be most useful for that purpose, but it is entirely unnecessary that we should be placed in a position to be able to go outside these Islands.

LORD LOVAT: I used the term "Empire" in the sense of the greater including the less.

*LORD HARRIS: In the matter of transport, my noble and gallant friend is very critical of the present arrangements. I can quite understand that from his great experience in South Africa he sees the enormous defects, if you can call them such, there are in the present arrangements; but, at any rate, they are an advance on what obtained before the war. In the case of my own regiment, I have been able to make a contract for such allowances of carts as are laid down in the regulations. I have not the slightest doubt that on the day of mobilisation those carts will be there, and for the work we have to do I believe they will be sufficient. It must be remembered that any scheme for the attack and invasion of England must be by a rush, and, if that is so, we may depend upon it that it will have to be replied to by a similar rush on our part against the invaders. There will be very little time to think of elaborate preparations for transport, heavy or light, or of the artificers—wheelwrights, saddlers, and so on. These are undoubtedly very necessary in a long campaign, but I doubt if they are highly essential in the kind of campaign which would undoubtedly take place in the event of an invasion of England. Therefore, upon points of that kind I confess I do not see with the same eye as my noble and gallant friend opposite.

But there are one or two points upon which I absolutely agree with him and with the noble Marquess. I do think it is ridiculous that we have got no second arm. We have the rifle, and some regiments have a certain number of swords, though not enough to arm all their men. But we have not got the arm which is generally attached to the weapon, the sword bayonet. The noble and gallant Field Marshal thinks the Yeomanry ought to have it, and has been trying to ascertain from the War Office why we have not got it. My regiment had it one year and then it was withdrawn. Why it was withdrawn I cannot say. If the War Office will only lay down which weapon we are to have, I am certain the men will give as close attention to its drill as they did when they had swords. At the present moment I have about half as many swords as I have men. A certain number are issued to each squadron for the purposes of sword drill. Nevertheless, the men have given their whole attention to the rifle and do not care for the sword as they used to.

As regards musketry, it is a little ungracious, perhaps, to criticise the War Office. The authorities are endeavouring, within such pecuniary means as are allowed them by the Treasury, to give opportunities in all parts of England for the study of their profession by soldiers; but, as a matter of fact, it is impossible, with only one school of musketry at Hythe, to train all the officers of the Auxiliary as well as the Regular Forces who are anxious to learn musketry. I would venture to suggest that a course as long as a month is hardly necessary in the case of officers of the Auxiliary Forces. This is one of the great difficulties. As regards signalling, the position is this. A grant is allowed to a regiment if it can produce a certain number of men who are signallers. I think the number is twelve; but those men cannot be called signallers unless there is an officer in the regiment who has gone through the school for two months. I have an officer in my regiment who is extremely anxious to get a certificate for signalling so as to qualify the men for the grant. In order to get it he is called upon to leave his business for two months in the year, which, of course, is impossible. He is ready to go to school in the town in which he lives, which happens to be a garrison town, but the authorities will not allow that. He must go the town where the school is. I think some modification of that regulation might be possible. Not that the grant is of very much value. It is more that the men should be encouraged by the knowledge that they are an organised group of signallers.

I do not, as I say, take the pessimistic view that my noble and gallant friend opposite does of the Imperial Yeomanry. I have known the Yeomanry for over thirty years. I knew what it was before the war, and I know what it is now, and we cannot be too grateful to the Government and especially to Mr. Brodrick for what he has done for that force. I firmly believe that if the kind of attack upon this country to which I have referred, and which I have always understood is the only kind of attack possible, should take place, the Yeomanry force will be a most useful body to set against it. There is this to be remembered, that every year the Yeomanry is turning into the civil population something between 3,000 and 5,000 men who have been taught to ride about the country with a rifle in their hand, and many of whom are first-class shots. Notwithstanding the various defects to which attention has been called, which I do not think are of the importance my noble and gallant friend imagines—although I join with him in the wish that the War Office may be able to help us in arriving at a greater state of efficiency—I contend that the Yeomany force is doing a great deal of good in the country.

THE EARL OF ERROLL: My Lords, I wish to make one or two remarks on the points raised by Lord Lovat, and on the question of inspection to which the Marquess of Winchester referred. I am entirely in accord with the noble Marquess as to the great importance of inspections, and I agree with him that some sort of continuity of inspection is desirable. I am not sure, however, that the noble Marquess fully appreciates the difficulties with which the War Office have to deal in this connection. Those difficulties arise principally from the fact that so many regiments come out at the same time, necessitating a very large number of inspectors. I think the difficulty might to a certain extent be overcome if the Yeomanry would help the War Office by making their arrangements so that the regiments did not all come out at the same time. If a variation of a few days was made it would be possible to meet the difficulty.

I will take as an instance Yorkshire. An officer might be able to inspect the Yorkshire Dragoons on Monday and Tuesday, the Hussars on Wednesday and Thursday, and the East Riding Regiment on Friday and Saturday. That would enable one officer to do this district, whereas three were required last year. We had to employ twelve inspecting officers last year. The only legitimate inspectors, putting on one side, of course, the late Commander-in-Chief, were the Inspector-General of Cavalry, the Inspector-General of Yeomanry —which position, I believe, is about to be done away with—and the Assistant Adjutant-General of Cavalry. After these three were employed it was necessary to go all over England to find other inspectors, and your Lordships will easily imagine the difficulty that arose. I believe that arrangements have been made this year to inspect the regiments in the Army Corps or in the district to which they belong, but this has not entirely done away with the difficulties the noble Lord alluded to, because in the North-Western district there is not a single cavalry regiment quartered, and inspectors will have to be borrowed from other parts of the country. I venture to suggest that some staff officer, preferably an ex-cavalry colonel, should be attached to each of the headquarters of districts so that he may be able to inspect the regiments in his district and also have charge of them at other times of the year, look after their musketry, etc., and act as brigadier. I venture to suggest with all due deference to Lord Lovat that ex-cavalry colonels might be the most efficient in this direction. I do not think the cavalry colonel who has had charge of a smart regiment will have much difficulty in picking up Yeomanry drill. If this practice were adopted of having a staff officer at the headquarters of each district, we should get greater continuity in the system of inspection, and the standard to which the Yeomanry hope to get would be much better understood.

It has been suggested that if Yeomanry regiments were not always inspected on the last two days, a large number of inspectors would not be necessary, but I should object to having them inspected on any days other than the last two, because regiments, as it were, "play up" for the inspection, and directly it is over a natural re-action sets in. I do not think that the days that succeed the inspection, if it were held earlier, would be so profitable as those which precede it. With regard to signalling, I think some simpler and more abbreviated form might be adopted. It is impossible to expect men who are not professional soldiers to give up three months, which is the length of the course the ordinary soldier has to go through, to learn signalling. I am perfectly certain that if some short and simple plan of signalling was adopted, by which the commander of a regiment or a column could tell what enemy was in sight and whether or not the ground was occupied on both flanks, that would be all that the Yeomanry would really want. This could be done by a very simple and abbreviated method of signalling which any man could learn in a few hours.

Now, as to the weapon. I believe there has been for the last two or three years a discussion at the War Office as to whether the men are to have swords or bayonets or a sort of hybrid weapon between the two. The result of this discussion is that at the present moment they have neither. I think this is a genuine cause of complaint on the part of the Yeomanry. The question of the places to which Yeomanry go for training is an important one. There are many places in the country which are absolutely unfitted for the Yeomanry—places in towns and populous districts, where it is impossible to teach them any scouting or reconnaissance—and I think it advisable that the Yeomanry should be taken away once in three years to some open country where they would have better opportunities of learning these services. I do not suppose they could be taken away oftener, as it would have a bad effect on recruiting. As to an advanced class for senior officers, that is a matter which I regard as of very great importance. One senior officer told me that he went to Aldershot last year with a view of making himself efficient, but was merely put through the same sort of training as the subalterns in his own regiment. I venture to think the discussion of these matters in your Lordships' House is extremely useful in calling attention to these details and eliciting the opinions of commanding officers and others. His Majesty's Government are at the present moment engaged in putting the whole forces of the country on a sound and satisfactory basis, and I think it is only fair to assume that the Yeomanry will not be left out.

THE MARQUESS OF WATERFORD: My Lords, I wish to say a word or two both with regard to the question of musketry instruction and inspection. As to the former, I feel sure the noble and gallant Lord will agree with me that the difficulty one often finds in persuading officers to join a Yeomanry regiment is not any lack of keenness on their part or lack of money—at any rate nowadays when the expenses of Yeomanry officers have been very much cut down—but it is that they are afraid they will not be able to give the necessary time to make themselves thoroughly efficient members of, and a credit to, their regiments. With regard to inspectors, I cannot claim to have been so unfortunate as one noble Lord who spoke just now, for I was inspected by four different Generals after only ten days training.

VISCOUNT GALWAY: My Lords, I heartily support the desirability of having shorter courses for officers and increased facilities for their getting at them. The difficulty Yeomanry colonels experience is in getting junior officers to join, and I think it is unreasonable to expect them to go down to Hythe for a month in addition to their training. I think they should be able to get a certificate at centres of musketry instruction in different parts of the United Kingdom. It is, as I say, impossible to expect one's junior officers to give up so much time as is required at present. A meeting of Yeomanry commanding officers last year unanimously agreed that some greater facilities ought to be given to field officers for training, and suggested that there should be a special course for these officers and that the course should not exceed a fortnight. As the noble and gallant Lord who initiated this discussion said, it is absurd to expect senior officers to go to school and receive similar instruction to that which is given to subalterns. I am quite sure, from the way the Yeomanry have been treated by the War Office during the last few years, that it is their intention to do what they can in its interests, and I hope they will meet the wishes of commanding officers on these points.

*THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (The Earl of DONOUGHMORE): My Lords, I do not think I have any right to complain of the tone of the debate this evening. On the other hand, I think I am fully entitled to congratulate myself on the references to the War Office and the amount of praise that has been showered upon us. I can assure noble Lords that we are most anxious to make the Yeomanry an efficient and useful force, if possible more efficient and useful than it is now. I welcome this discussion, for it is only by personal discussion with members of Yeomanry regiments that we are able to find out these deficiencies, which, of course, cannot be so patent to our eyes as they are to the eyes of noble Lords who are themselves members of the Imperial Yeomanry. I welcome any debate raised on this subject by the noble and gallant Lord opposite, because I know full well that when he does start a debate that debate is certain to be rich in schemes of all sorts. I welcome these schemes; but I am sure the noble and gallant Lord would not expect that I should accept all of them offhand. If the schemes are subsequently adopted and are a success, naturally the noble and gallant Lord gets all the credit for them; but if they are not found to be a success, the noble and gallant Lord's existence is forgotten for the moment, and we get all the blame.

The first point that has been raised is the necessity for a steel weapon for the Imperial Yeomanry. We are in rather a difficult position as regards this. I confess I have been quite unable to discover in the Papers I have here the reason why some three years ago the bayonet was withdrawn from the Imperial Yeomanry. Still, the fact remains that that decision was come to, and we are now asked to reconsider the decision. I would remind your Lordships that there is considerable difference on this point even among officers of the Imperial Yeomanry. A few still cling to the idea that they would like to have a sword. Many colonels argue in favour of the bayonet; one distinguished officer has suggested a battle-axe; and others think they should have nothing at all. The greater weight of opinion, however, I believe leans towards the bayonet, and I will certainly see that the matter is most carefully gone into. I may, however, be allowed to sound a note of warning. A distinguished Yeomanry Officer, one of the first to go to South Africa, spoke to me this morning on this subject. He prefers that the present state of things should continue, and that the Yeomanry should be armed with the rifle and nothing else. He expressed the opinion that a bayonet is an uncomfortable thing for a mounted man to wear, and he said that his experience in South Africa was that generally the Imperial Yeoman threw his bayonet away at the first opportunity. It was, he says, sometimes found useful as a picketing peg, or for cutting wire, but to use it on his rifle was the last thing the Yeoman thought of. I am sure your Lordships will sympathise with us when we say there is a great deal to be said on both sides. I can only promise that I will ask those of my colleagues whose business it is to deal with this question of weapons to give it their early consideration.

The next point I turn to was that raised by the Marquess of Winchester as to the period of re-attestment. I discussed that question only this morning with some of my colleagues on the Army Council, and they promised to go into it at once. As to the question of inspection, the exact state of the case has, I think, been fully stated by my noble friend the Earl of Erroll, and I am glad to say that we hope in the early future to make arrangements for carrying out more effectually the inspection of the Imperial Yeomanry, taking especial note of the fact that there should be continuity of inspection year after year by the same officer, where possible. The next point raised was in regard to the training of the men in musketry. This is one of the most unsatisfactory things in connection with the training of the Yeomanry. In conversation this morning with the Inspector - General of Auxiliary Forces, he informed me that he has in his mind a scheme which he hopes to work out with assistance from officers of the Imperial Yeomanry, and which, I hope, will prove a remedy for the present not at all satisfactory state of things.

As regards the training in musketry of officers and non-commissioned officers, the noble and gallant Lord has suggested that we should have local courses held in various parts of the country. Local courses for officers in some things are easy to arrange, and we are glad to arrange them. When noble Lords come forward, in the patriotic way my noble and gallant friend did last year by placing his house at our disposal to hold a course for the Imperial Yeomanry in Scotland, we are glad to avail ourselves of these opportunities. But a local course in musketry is a different thing. We have all the facilities to our hand at Hythe, and we think that the result of a course there is bound to be infinitely more advantageous for the individual officer than if carried out where there are not the same facilities. The course for officers of the Auxiliary Forces at Hythe has lately been very much simplified. We have knocked out a great many things that we teach officers of the Regular Army, on the ground that they are superfluous for officers of the Auxiliary Forces.

*Lord LOVAT: You have added to the length of your course.

*The Earl of DONOUGHMORE: Yes, but we have taken out instruction in foreign rifles and one or two other things, and we concentrate a great deal of attention now on fire control. We are issuing Maxims to the Imperial Yeomanry. Thirty-eight have so far been issued, and we intend to issue two per regiment. I think, therefore, the time spent in the musketry course over the Maxim gun is not wasted. The noble and gallant Lord raised another point which I confess was new to me—the question of the senior officers' course at the school of musketry; but I shall be glad to see that it is inquired into. I hope, though I can give no pledge in the matter, that we shall be able to make an arrangement such as the noble and gallant Lord asks for, if senior officers come forward in sufficient numbers. I am afraid I cannot go into the question of organisation in any great detail. The Committee of Imperial Defence is now considering the whole question of the employment of the Auxiliary Forces in time of war, and, pending any decision on their part, I am afraid I cannot enter at length into the questions on that head raised by my noble and gallant friend. With regard, however, to training itself, a new manual is in proof. It has been prepared very carefully by a committee of distinguished officers, including Lord Chesham, and I hope it will satisfy all the demands that will be made upon it. The question of staff officers is also one on which I cannot say very much, partly for the reason that the work of this force and the organisation of the staff is under consideration, and partly because we are to have a debate in the near future upon this question of the staff and I should be unwilling to anticipate the opportunity we shall then have of dealing with this subject at greater length.

As regards signalling, we are every bit as anxious as noble Lords are that the Yeomen should become efficient signallers, but I think your Lordships will see that it is quite impossible for us to lower the present standard. I am quite certain that the suggestion of my noble and gallant friend behind me could be adopted, and a simpler system of signalling drawn up which would be very useful for the Imperial Yeomanry to use among themselves. But in war time it would be necessary for the Yeomanry signallers to take their part as signallers of the whole Army, and to have a large number of signallers who had been trained only in an elementary course and were unable to communicate with signallers drawn from the rest of the Army would obviously not be of much use. I hope the noble and gallant Lords do not think the attainment of the standard we desire is absolutely impossible. It is the same standard that we ask for from the Regular Army and from the Volunteers. I may be told that the Volunteers have more time at their disposal for these things, but the fact remains that many corps of Volunteers are able to attain to a standard in signalling which is quite as high as, and in some cases higher, than that attained by some regiments of the Regular Army. I hope the day will not be far distant when the Yeomanry will be able to reach the same standard.

With the noble and gallant Lord's remarks on the subject of transport I think it is unnecessary for me to deal, as this subject has already been dealt with by Lord Harris. We give all the assistance we can to regiments of Imperial Yeomanry in time of peace, and each unit is supposed to have a scheme in existence providing a full complement of vehicles and horses for its requirements in time of war. The officers of the Imperial Yeomanry are permitted to attend a course in Army Service Corps work. They receive allowances while there and travelling expenses, and I hope that the amount of help they get from the War Office may enable them to qualify themselves, at any rate to be useful and of assistance to us in formulating any transport arrangements that may be necessary in home defence. I can assure your Lordships that the noble and gallant Lord opposite is a little bashful as regards the force he belongs to. It is a good deal more efficient than would be gathered from his speech. We are satisfied with the progress that has been made since the great Yeomanry movement took root, and we earnestly hope that the efficiency which the force has reached may be continued and even exceeded, for we are confident the Yeomanry are a useful portion of the defence forces of the country.

THE RESERVATION OF THE COASTING TRADE.

LORD MUSKERRY: My Lords, I rise to call the attention of His Majesty's Government to the practice of other maritime countries reserving what is termed their coastwise trade to vessels of their own nationality, and to refer to certain recommendations and Resolutions on this subject; to ask what has been the nature of the representations of His Majesty's Government to the United States Government respecting the proposed application to the Philippine Islands of the coastwise laws of the United States; also, whether the United States Government have as yet forwarded any definite reply to the representations referred to.

In June of last year I brought this matter before your Lordships, and quoted the recommendation of the Subsidies Committee and the Resolution adopted at the Conference of Colonial Premiers, to the effect that the coastal trade of Great Britain and the trade with her colonies and possessions should be reserved to British ships or to ships of those countries who throw open the trade between their different ports to our ships. I gave the views of Sir Robert Giffen, a recognised authority, that this would mean an increase of nine per cent. in the trade of British ships. I do not know the source of his information, but my noble friend representing the Board of Trade stated that the question practically affected Russia and the United States alone. I venture to say that if he will refer to the Report of the Subsidies Committee it will tell another story. Though the Board of Trade received my representations in a very lukewarm manner, despite the authorities supporting me, I was glad to find that Sir Robert Giffen's estimate of gain to British ships did not seem very far wrong. I had also the satisfaction of being accorded an assurance by the noble Marquess the Leader of the House that the matter would not be lost sight of.

I was told both by him and by my noble friend representing the Board of Trade that this important question was connected with the larger question of the fiscal policy, and therefore, my Lords, it seems clear to me that if the representations which the noble Marquess has made to the United States Government are in the nature of intercession on behalf of British ships and British trade, the Government have now made the first move in altering a policy which has proved so detrimental to the shipping trade of this country. I am aware that a resolution as to the reservation of the coastwise trade was carried by a large majority at the annual meeting of the Chamber of Shipping of the United Kingdom, and it is significant that the resolution which followed and which was agreed to at that meeting was one calling the attention of His Majesty's Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to the fact that British shipping would be excluded from July next from the carrying trade between the Philippines and the United States; the consequence being that a large amount of British shipping will from that date be shut out from an important trade.

His Majesty's Government were respectfully requested to make suitable representations to the United States of America upon the subject. All those who are connected with or have that interest in shipping which they should will be gratified at the fact that His Majesty's Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs has responded to the appeal of the shipowners in this matter. I gather from his preliminary reply to the Secretary of the Chamber of Shipping that the United States authorities are postponing making the change they contemplate for twelve months. I am far from being alone in my desire to know the character of the representations which have been officially made to the United States Government on this vitally important subject. It seems to me to constitute a precedent which may have far-reaching results and will justify similar representations being made to other maritime Powers reserving their coastwise trade to their own ships.

I also hope that it may be a step in the direction of British ships being eventually manned by our own subjects, or at least of ensuring that aliens shall not be permitted to command or officer British vessels. It is really appalling to think that in British sailing vessels the number of aliens outnumbers the number of our own subjects serving in them. Some of our vessels seem to be alien in everything but in name. I trust that the noble Marquess representing His Majesty's Government may be able to give us some further information on the representations he has made to the United States Government, and that they will prove to be a forerunner towards British ships being allowed a fair field in all trades. We extend this fair field to the ships of all maritime nations, and we have a right to expect other nations to extend the same privilege to our ships.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: My Lords, the Resolution of the Conference of Colonial Premiers, to which the noble Lord alluded, has been referred to the Colonial Governments for their opinions. We have received some but not all of their replies, and these replies vary very much in their tenor. Some of the Colonial Governments are entirely opposed to the idea of excluding foreign vessels from coastwise trade. Others, on the contrary, desired, or intended, to do so. The House of Commons Shipping Subsidies Committee made the suggestion that foreign vessels frequenting British ports should be made subject to the same Board of Trade regulations as British vessels, and we have quite lately appointed a Committee for the purpose of inquiring into that subject. As to the general question which the noble Lord has raised there can be no doubt that the present system under which certain Powers are allowed free access to our coastwise trade while they deny access to their coasting trade to British vessels is an unfair one, and that it operates most disadvantageously to this country. Of course the extent of the injustice is increased when we call to mind that what we speak of in this connection as coasting trade does not mean coasting trade between one port on the seaboard of the British islands to another port on the same seaboard, but means what can be more properly described as Imperial trade—trade, I mean, which passes between, say, the Port of London and an Australian seaport, or, taking the case of a Foreign Power, such trade as that which passes, let us say, between New York and San Francisco, or between a Baltic port and Vladivostok.

While I entirely realise the injustice done to our commerce by its exclusion from certain portions of the coasting trade of other Powers, I think we must be careful not to exaggerate the extent of the grievance, because it is not the case that that exclusion is by any means general or universal. Out of the seven Powers which do a large amount of coasting trade four—Germany, Holland, Denmark, and Portugal—admit our vessels freely to their coasting trade. France does the same with the exception of Algerian trade, which is specially reserved. There are only two considerable Powers—Russia and the United States—which exclude us altogether. It is necessary to bear in mind when you speak of the possibility of retaliatory action on these Powers that they are, as it happens, the very Powers which make least use of our coasting trade and which consequently afford the smallest target for reprisals. Indeed, it is necessary to remember that the whole foreign participation in our coasting trade is relatively insignificant. Of our coasting trade in the narrower sense of the word—that which passes along the coasts of the United Kingdom—99 per cent. of the whole is already in British hands. Of the larger coasting trade which we are discussing this evening 88 per cent. is in British hands, and 12 per cent. only in the hands of foreigners. The total coasting trade amounts to 38,000,000 tons, of which 33,000,000 tons are in British hands. Therefore the 12 per cent. in foreign hands represents 5,000,000 tons. I do not say that that is an amount which can be dismissed as of no importance; but many matters have to be considered before we can entertain the idea of restricting the conditions under which that proportion of our coasting trade is carried by foreign vessels.

It is obvious that if we were to exclude foreigners from access to our coasting trade altogether we should find ourselves liable to reprisals at the hands of those countries which do at present admit us. That would be a serious matter. We should also have to anticipate that those foreign vessels which we exclude from our trade would reappear somewhere else in the guise of competitors with British vessels. Besides that we should certainly have to think twice before we took any steps which might have the effect of interfering with what is known as the *entrepôt* trade of this country. Large quantities of goods come here for re-export to other countries. It is obvious that if facilities of access were denied to trade of that character the result might be to drive it to the ports and emporiums of foreign Powers. I mention these considerations because I think it necessary to bear in mind that in matters of this kind it is necessary to proceed with great caution, and with an anticipation of the remoter results which might follow from the adoption of hasty or ill-considered steps. Moreover, this question is intimately connected with the larger and more difficult question of the fiscal problem, which we have frequently debated in this House, and which we cannot be expected to deal with in a fragmentary manner. I am afraid, therefore, that, though there is a grievance, I cannot hold out to the noble Lord any prospects of our immediately adopting the steps of which he is, I understand, in favour.

In answer to his specific Question with regard to the treatment of British commerce in the Philippine Islands, I have to say that in 1903 a Bill was introduced in Congress under which the trade passing between the United States and the

Philippine Islands was declared to be coastwise trade, and under which foreign vessels were denied participation in that trade. That restriction seemed to us on the face of it inconsistent with certain declarations which had been made by the United States Government at the time when the treaty of peace was entered into between Spain and the United States. We desired our representative to call the attention of the United States Government to the matter and to point out the effects of the restriction on the commerce of this country. These discussions are still proceeding, and I do not think it would be for the public interest that I should enter into details with regard to them. The Bill to which I referred just now was, however, altered during its passage through Congress, and in the shape in which it ultimately became law at the beginning of the year it is laid down that the application of the new law to the trade of the United States and the Philippines shall not come into effect until 1906. There is, therefore, time to consider the matter. It is certainly one which deserves and shall receive the attention of the Government.

Earl SPENCER: My Lords, I am afraid the sparse attendance on these Benches at the present moment rather points to the fact that your Lordships' House hardly realises the great importance of the question raised by the noble Lord. I only rise to say that I value the statement of the noble Marquess and the decision arrived at. There is very little doubt that the position of foreign vessels and our coastwise trade is of the greatest possible importance. It is of enormous importance to the *entrepôt* trade of the country, and anything that affected this question might be full of disaster to the country. I am, therefore, glad that the noble Marquess has not given countenance to the proposals of the noble Lord. What we have to fear in dealing with these questions is the prospect of serious reprisals against our trade; and I hope that the point will be considered by His Majesty's Government when the Report of the Committee is presented.

House adjourned at five minutes past Seven o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 13th June, 1904.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

SUBSTITUTED BILLS (STANDING ORDER 62 COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, referred on the First Reading thereof, Standing Order 62 has been complied with, viz.:—Loch Leven Water Power Bill. Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time.

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz.:—Richard Jaeger's Patent Bill [Lords]. Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time.

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS [LORDS] (NO STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, no Standing Orders are applicable, viz.:—Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 1) Bill [Lords]. Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time To-morrow.

POST OFFICE SITES BILL (STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE THERETO COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, referred pursuant to the Order of the House of the 3rd day of June, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz.:—Post Office Sites Bill.

Colney Hatch Gas Bill; Gomersal Gas Bill; North Staffordshire Railway Bill. Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Chesterfield Gas and Water Board Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

London County Council (Money) Bill. Read the third time, and passed.

London County Council (Tramways and Improvements) Bill. Read the third time, and passed. [New Title.]

New River Company Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered; an Amendment made; Bill to be read the third time.

Tynemouth Gas Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

Education Board Provisional Order Bill (Swansea); Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 14) Bill; Local Government Provisional Order (No. 15) Bill. Read the third time, and passed.

Dundee, Broughty Ferry, and District Tramways Order Confirmation Bill; Leith Burgh Order Confirmation Bill; Motherwell and Bellshill Railway (Abandonment) Order Confirmation Bill. Considered; to be read the third time upon Wednesday.

Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Provisional Order Bill. Read a second time, and committed.

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP H).

Sir HENRY AUBREY-FLETCHER reported from the Committee on Group H of Private Bills, That the Parties opposing the Matlock and District Gas Bill [Lords] had stated that the evidence of John Thomas Coates, of Derby, was essential to their case; and, it having been proved that his attendance could not be procured without the intervention of the House, he had been instructed to move that the said John Thomas Coates do attend the said Committee on Monday, 13th June, at Three of the clock.

Ordered, That John Thomas Coates do attend the Committee on Group H of Private Bills this day, at Three of the clock.

Clyde Navigation (Works) Bill. Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table.

Street Betting Bill [Lords]. Read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 230.]

Local Government Provisional Order (No. 4) Bill. Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table. Bill, as amended, to be considered To-morrow.

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP I).

Sir JOHN BRUNNER reported from the Committee on Group I of Private Bills; That, for the convenience of parties, they had adjourned till Tuesday, 21st June, at Twelve o'clock.

Report to lie upon the Table.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to — Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill; Local Government Provisional Order (Poor Law) Bill, without Amendment.

Kirkby-in-Ashfield Urban District Gas Bill; Littlestone-on-Sea and District Water Bill; Brixham Gas Bill; Acton Improvement Bill, with Amendments.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to extend the limits of supply of the Newcastle and Gateshead Water Company; and to enable local authorities within the additional limits to require the Company to supply them with water in bulk; and to empower the Company to raise further capital; and for other purposes." [Newcastle and Gateshead Water Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to authorise the closing and sale of certain churches in the city of Liverpool and the borough of Wigan and the sale of certain vicarages or houses of residence, the extinction of certain ecclesiastical districts and parishes, the merger thereof in other districts and parishes, and the conversion of certain ecclesiastical districts into separate ecclesiastical parishes in the said city; and for other purposes." [Liverpool and Wigan Churches Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confer further powers on the Derwent Valley Water Board; to confer powers upon the Corporation of Leicester with respect to the works authorised to be constructed by that Corporation under the powers of The Derwent Valley Water Act, 1899; to confer borrowing powers upon the Corporations of Derby, Leicester, Sheffield, and Nottingham; and for other purposes." [Derwent Valley Water Board Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to empower the Lord Mayor, Aldermen, and Citizens of the city of Belfast to construct and work Tramways, and to purchase by agreement the undertaking of the Belfast Street Tramways Company, including the Tramways constructed by the Sydenham District Belfast Tramways Company, and the Belfast and Ligoniel Tramways Company, and the Tramways of the Belfast and County Down Railway Company; and for other purposes." [Belfast Corporation (Tramways) Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act for incorporating and conferring powers on The Lothians Electric Power Company." [The Lothians Electric Power Bill [Lords.]

Newcastle and Gateshead Water Bill [Lords]; Liverpool and Wigan Churches Bill [Lords]; Derwent Valley Water Board Bill [Lords]; Belfast Corporation (Tramways) Bill [Lords]; The Lothians Electric Power Bill [Lords]. Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

Preston, Chorley, and Horwich Tramways Bill [Lords]; Tyneside Tramways and Tramroads Bill [Lords]. Reported, with Amendments; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Two Petitions from Aberdeen, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Edinburgh, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

FACTORY AND WORKSHOP ACT (1901) AMENDMENT BILL.

Petition from Sanitary Institute, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions against; from London; Stourbridge (four); Wollaston; Leicester; Glasgow; Bournemouth; Brighton; Lee; Darlaston (two); Chester (four); Bransgore; Inverurie; Portsmouth; Saltney; King's Hill; Richmond; Blackburn; Darlaston Green; Halton; Runcorn (two); Wellington; Wood Green; Worsley; Budleigh Salterton; Harrow Road; Moxley; Worksop; Hulland; Aston; Corbridge; Wall; Hexhamshire; Mickley; Harlow Hill; Ovington; Hexham (two); Hedley; Huncote; Walkden; Gunnerton; Barrasford; Wark; Stocksfield; Horsley; Rangeworthy; Bradley; Wednesbury; Oldbury; Humshaugh; Wylam; Newton; Hampstead; Jarrow; Adderbury; Lampeter; Greenock; Wolverhampton; Pen (two); Wigan; Cilgwyn; Wye Valley; Tregaron; Lavender Hill; Horsley Fields; Somerleyton; Wandsworth; Blyth; Boldon Colliery; Selby; Jarrow; Llanarmon; Tregeiriog; Flushing; Huntley; Stepney; Cwmbran; Kirkwall; Rochdale (two); Brecon; Llanfaes; Durham; Kiveton Park; Rotherham; Women's National Liberal Association; Doncaster; Balby; Sheffield; Leamington; Hastings; Hendon; Denaby Main; Blairgowrie; Choppington Colliery; Market Drayton (two); West Cornwall; Whitchurch; Heywood; Gloucester; Hollinwood; Gospel Ash; Whixall; Crimsworth; Boosbeck; Bill Quay; Paisley; Banbury; Ebbw Vale; Penrith; Lochans; Sowerby Bridge; Montrose; Daventry and Long Buckby; Daventry; Newburn-on-Tyne; Bridgend District; Dunston; Wolverhampton; Doncaster; Guisborough and Redcar; and Hendon; to lie upon the Table.

PREVENTION OF POLLUTION OF RIVERS AND STREAMS BILL.

Petition from Sanitary Institute, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF BUTTER BILL.

Petition from Sanitary Institute, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

VALUATION BILL.

Petition from Liverpool, against; to lie upon the Table.

VALUATION BILL.

Petition from Stourbridge, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

VALUATION BILL.

Petitions in favour; from Sheffield; and Sunderland; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

MERCHANT SEAMEN'S FUND.

Paper [presented 10th June] to be printed. [No. 208.]

ARRESTS FOR DRUNKENNESS (IRELAND).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 19th May; *Mr. Sloan*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 209.]

SAVINGS BANKS AND FRIENDLY SOCIETIES.

Accounts presented, showing the Interest accrued in respect of the Securities standing in the names of the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt to the credit of the Post Office Savings Banks Fund for the year ended 31st December, 1903, and of the Fund for the Banks for Savings and the Fund for Friendly Societies for the year ended 20th November, 1903 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 210.]

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3182 to 3184 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

COUNTY AND BOROUGH LUNATIC ASYLUMS.

Address for "Return of Expenditure on Lunatic Asylums up to the 1st day of January, 1904, and of the average Cost per head of Lunatics during the year ended the 31st day of March, 1903:—

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.		
							Receipts from—		
Asylum.	Number of Patients provided for on the 1st day of January, 1904.	Total cost of buildings and land up to the 1st day of January, 1904.	Cost per bed of buildings and land.	Average weekly cost per head in respect of interest and repayment of loans for land and buildings, rental of land and buildings, and repairs, for year ended the 31st day of March, 1903.	Average weekly cost per head for maintenance and other charges not included in Column 5, for year ended the 31st day of March, 1903.	Total average weekly cost per head for year ended 31st day of March, 1903.	(a) Parliamentary grants, and payments by County and County Borough Councils from Exchequer Contribution Account.	(b) Payment for Patients.	(c) Rates.
Totals:									
England and Wales									
Scotland									
Ireland									
Grand Totals									

—(*Mr. Charles Hobhouse.*)

SHOPS.

Address for "Return showing the counties and boroughs in which Inspectors have been appointed under The Shop Hours Acts, 1892 to 1895, and The Seats for Shop Assistants Act, 1899, and number of Inspectors appointed, in the following form:—

1.	2.	3.	4.
Counties and boroughs in which Inspectors have been appointed.	Total number of Inspectors appointed.	Inspectors giving their whole time to duties under the Shop Hours and Seats for Shop Assistants Acts.	Inspectors performing duties under the Shop Hours and Seats for Shop Assistants Acts in conjunction with other public duties.

—(*Sir Charles Dilke.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

The "Enchantress."

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if the yacht "Enchantress" is now in commission; what is the difference between her cost as finished and the estimate on which the order was given; where did the speed trials take place, and what was the realised speed as compared with the speed contracted for; did coal consumption trials take place and, if so, what were the results; and what was the duration of the speed, and coal consumption trials respectively.

(*Answered by Mr. Pretyman.*) Through inadvertence an incorrect figure was given in reply to the second part of the hon. Member's Question of 9th instant.† The accepted contract price for the yacht "Enchantress" was £120,882. Certain additions asked for since the contract was made amount to £3,701 0s. 4d., making a total of £124,583 0s. 4d., as stated in my answer of the 29th March last.‡

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if it is customary to accept vessels which have not fulfilled conditions of contract; whether any attempt was made in the case of the "Enchantress" to get eighteen knots speed; what was the highest speed attained, and what power was developed at that speed; what was the horse power developed on the trial at fifteen knots, and what number of runs on the measured mile did it consist of; of what duration was the coal consumption trial at fifteen knots, and was it carried out in the customary Admiralty fashion; what is the stability of the "Enchantress" with water in boilers, bunkers full, and stores on board, but without ballast; has it been necessary to add any ballast for stability purposes; and, if so, how much; have the Admiralty definitely accepted the vessel; and has the final instalment been paid.

(*Answered by Mr. Pretyman.*) Taking the different sections of the hon. Member's Question seriatim, the replies are as follows:—

1. No.
2. Yes.
3. 17·5 knots. i.h.p. 6,077.
4. i.h.p. 2,829 for 14·892 knots. Four runs. i.h.p. 3,191 for 15·22 knots for 24 hours.
5. 24 hours. Yes.
6. Metacentric height 16 inches.
7. Yes.
8. 200 tons.
9. No.
10. No.

Marine Insurance Bill.

SIR ALBERT ROLLIT (Islington, S.): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether the Marine Insurance (Codification) Bill will be re-introduced into this House in time to admit of its passing through its subsequent stages and becoming law during the present session.

(*Answered by Mr. A. J. Balfour.*) The Bill is one I am very desirous of passing into law; but, in the present state of public business, there seems little hope of this, unless it is possible to come to some general agreement among Members interested. I hope it will prove that such an agreement is possible.

---

† See page 1210.

‡ See (4) *Debates*, cxxxii., 959.

British Salvage Companies and Naval Work.

SIR JOHN LENG (Dundee): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the Board have had under consideration the length of time occupied by the Swedish Salvage Company in raising Submarine A 1; why the Admiralty's own officials did not undertake the operations with the plant from Portsmouth Dockyard; and whether, failing the establishment of a Naval Salvage Corps, opportunity will be given to British salvage companies and associations to offer for such work in British waters.

(*Answered by Mr. Pretyman.*) The Admiralty have considered the length of time occupied and have noted it. The necessary plant from Portsmouth Dockyard was at once sent to the wreck; but, as explained in my reply to the hon. Member for Camberwell on 14th April,† the weather at the time was not favourable for the employment of lighters, as the swell caused the wire hawsers to carry away. The Admiralty are always prepared to consider offers for salvage work, and have already made use of the services of British salvage companies; but time is such an important element in nearly all salvage operations, that the decision to employ any particular firm, whether British or foreign, must be largely influenced by the facility with which they can begin work. In the case of Submarine A 1 the Swedish Company's vessel was on the spot.

Piecework in Devonport Dockyard.

MR. BELL (Derby): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether, in view of the fact that the system of piecework introduced into His Majesty's Dockyard, Devonport, has been the means of throwing out of employment a number of men, whilst others are earning sums varying up to £3 8s. per week above their wages, he will state whether any number of men are about to be discharged; and, if so, whether the piecework system is responsible for such further discharge.

(*Answered by Mr. Pretyman.*) It is not the fact that the system of piecework at Devonport has been the means of throwing out of employment a number of men, nor has the premium system, recently introduced for trial, had any such effect. On the contrary, the number of men now employed is slightly greater than on the 1st April last. No man employed in the Dockyard has earned £3 8s. per week above his wages, or anything approaching that sum, under either of these systems. Some adjustment of trades has been necessary to meet variations of work, but this has not been in consequence of either the piecework or the premium system. It is possible that there may be further discharges due to similar re-adjustments of trade.

Opportunities for learning Telegraph Work—Case of Mr. Chandler.

MR. HENDERSON (Durham, Barnard Castle): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that a telegraphist named Chandler has been placed upon duties which give him no opportunity for perfecting himself in telegraphic manipulation, and that he asked for facilities to acquire a thorough knowledge, but his request was refused; and whether, in view of the fact that he has now been informed that his increment may be arrested because of his ignorance of telegraphic work, he will direct that this telegraphist shall be given equal opportunities with his fellow clerks.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) If the telegraphist referred to is Mr. Chandler, a sorting clerk and telegraphist at Middlesbrough, that officer is engaged in turn with his fellows upon the sorting and telegraph duties he is capable of doing. All the circumstances of his case have already been examined more than once both by my predecessor and myself, and I am quite satisfied that he has received proper treatment.

Post Office Examination at Cork—Outsiders in Limited Competitions.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that two persons, John Murray and Daniel Downing, who were not servants of the Post Office, were lately allowed to compete in the limited examination at Cork; whether this was contrary to regulations, such examinations being reserved for persons already in Post Office employ; and, if so, what steps he proposes to take to remedy the hardship suffered by other competitors who failed to secure the vacancies competed for, owing to Messrs. Murray and Downing being allowed to compete.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxxxiii., 194.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) The hon. Member appears to be under a misapprehension. Both of the persons referred to had served as assistants at sub-post offices in Ireland for some time, and were eligible, under the regulations, to enter the limited competition in question.

Extension of Telephone Service to Nenagh.

MR. P. J. O'BRIEN (Tipperary, N.): To ask the Postmaster-General, in view of the extension to Nenagh of the telephone connection to Limerick, he will take into account the position of that town as a commercial centre; and if he will make inquires as to the business at Nenagh Post Office in regard to telegrams received and sent from there; and if it affords the assurance that the business provided by the merchants and others would more than guarantee that sufficient support would be obtained for a telephone exchange at Nenagh, he will give it his favourable consideration.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) The circumstances mentioned by the hon. Member will be kept in view in considering the question of connecting Nenagh with the telephone system of the United Kingdom. The decision must, however, chiefly depend upon the use likely to be made of the trunk telephone lines, as shown by the number of persons who are willing to rent exchange lines at Nenagh at the ordinary tariff rates. It is mainly upon this point that information is required.

Poor Law Children Suffering from Ringworm and Ophthalmia.

SIR WALTER FOSTER (Derbyshire, Ilkeston): To ask the President of the Local Government Board if he will state the number of Poor Law children of the metropolis who are at present suffering from ringworm and ophthalmia respectively, differentiating between those housed in the Metropolitan Asylums Board special homes, those in workhouses and workhouse infirmaries, and those in the district and separate Poor Law schools.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) I am informed that the number of Metropolitan Poor Law children at present suffering from ringworm and ophthalmia respectively in the special homes and institutions under the control of the Metropolitan Asylums Board, is as follows:—

Ringworm.	Ophthalmia.
566	345

The following is the number of these children in workhouses and workhouse infirmaries, and in district and separate Poor Law schools on the 2nd April last, which is the latest date for which I can give the figures desired:—

	Ringworm.	Ophthalmia.
Workhouses and workhouse infirmaries - -	184	236
District and separate schools, including cottage homes and scattered homes - -	159	156

Nursing of Sick Poor in Workhouses—Local Government Board Order.

SIR HARRY SAMUEL (Tower Hamlets, Limehouse): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether boards of guardians of England and Wales will be given an opportunity of expressing their opinion upon the contemplated order to be issued by the Local Government Board consequent upon the recommendations of the Departmental Committee upon the nursing of the sick poor in workhouses; and whether a draft of such order can be furnished to the Poor Law Unions' Association of England and Wales before the same is made absolute.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) I have received a large number of representations from boards of guardians on the Report of the Departmental Committee on Nursing which has led to the proposed order, and these representations have been duly considered. I cannot undertake to afford to boards of guardians generally any further opportunity of making representations on this subject; but I will consider the suggestion in the latter part of the Question.

Poor Law Children Emigrated to Canada.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL (Yorkshire, Cleveland): To ask the President of the Local Government Board if he can state the number of Poor Law children emigrated to Canada during the year 1903.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) The number of Poor Law children emigrated to Canada during 1903 was 398.

Royal Commission on Local Taxation—Representation of Boards of Guardians.

MR. OSMOND WILLIAMS (Merionethshire): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether boards of guardians were represented upon the Royal Commission on Local Taxation; and, if not, will he state what was the reason of their not being represented.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) I was not concerned in the recommendations made in 1896 of persons to serve on the Royal Commission on Local Taxation, and, therefore, I cannot speak with any authority as to the grounds upon which the recommendations were based. I observe, however, that, although boards of guardians do not appear to have been specifically represented on it, several members were or had been more or less connected with these authorities.

Uniformity of Valuation.

MR. OSMOND WILLIAMS: To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether, in view of the number of unions situated in two or more administrative counties, he will state what steps he proposes to take to secure that the substitution of county areas for union areas shall promote the uniformity of valuation as between valuation authorities.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) I think it will be more convenient to deal with questions of this kind in debate on the Valuation Bill.

Promotion of Income-tax Clerks in Ireland.

MR. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether, in view of the increase of clerical work in Irish income-tax districts since July, 1900, he will raise the clerks in 4th class districts from their present scales D and F respectively to higher scales as the circumstances of their several districts may suggest, seeing that promotion to these clerks is otherwise practically impossible, only one transfer to England having been effected in four years past.

(*Answered by Mr. Victor Cavendish.*) I am advised that the circumstances do not warrant any increase in the salaries of these officials.

Tea Duty—Bulking of Parcels of Tea in Bond.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, in the interests of trade, he would inquire why the Board of Customs refused, in April last, to grant a special request made by the proprietors of Butler's Wharf to bulk together three small parcels of Indian tea, considering that the request was not outside the spirit of the standing regulations governing the importation of Indian and Ceylon teas, as contained in Revenue Code, paragraph 430; and, also, whether, seeing its importance to the tea trade, he has any objection to laying the Papers and Reports dealing with the matter in question upon the Table of the House.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) The intention of the Code of Warehousing Regulations (which are common to the Customs and Inland Revenue Departments) is to keep within reasonable limits the performance on dutiable goods in bonded warehouses of operations which can be readily performed in trader's private premises outside Revenue control. Every extension of the kinds of operations which may be performed in bond necessarily entails additional expense to the Crown. Paragraph 430 of the Code permits the bulking together of beds of Indian teas under certain conditions, and the proprietors of Butler's Wharf had availed themselves of this permission in regard to the teas in question. They desired, however, to perform a further operation on the tea before clearance from bond by re-bulking together an entire bed and parts of two other beds. No special reason for the request was stated in the application except that it was desired to get one even sample, and the Board of Customs, after careful consideration, felt themselves unable to grant the request on the grounds. (*a*) That the operation allowed by the standing regulations had already been performed on the teas. (*b*) That it was open to the proprietors of the teas to have paid the duty and removed the teas to private premises where the operation could have been performed. (*c*) That to grant a special concession of this kind to one particular firm in relation to an operation in bond would have created a precedent which would have been immediately followed by other requests of the same kind, thereby rendering it impossible to maintain the regulation, and entailing increase of expenditure for supervision. If the tea trade desire the amendment of a particular regulation of the Code affecting their interests, the Board would be perfectly ready to consider such a measure on its merits. The Reports of Customs' Officers are of a confidential character, and I cannot undertake to lay them upon the Table of the House.

Condition of Gôkteik Railway Bridge, Upper Burma.

MR. W. F. D. SMITH (Strand, Westminster): To ask the Secretary of State for India if he can state the present condition of the Goktiek Railway Bridge in Upper Burma, and by what firm was the bridge constructed; whether at the time when the bridge was being built representations were made by the Acting Chief Engineer for Construction to the effect that unsound work was being put in by the contractors; and whether he is ready to appoint a Committee to inquire into the whole matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) The Gokteik Railway Bridge was constructed by the Pennsylvania Steel Company for the Burma Railways Company. When the bridge was being built representations were made by the Acting Chief Engineer for Construction to the effect that unsound work was being put in by the contractors, but these representations were not confirmed on subsequent inquiry by the Burma Railway Company's engineers or the Government inspector. I am informed by the company that there is no reason for supposing the present condition of the bridge to be unsound, and that a report which they received on it in 1901 was to the effect that it was in all respects a good piece of work.

Relations between India and Afghanistan.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): To ask the Secretary of State for India whether His Highness the Amir of Afghanistan has refused to accept the £40,000 per annum which is paid him in consideration of his good feeling towards the Indian Government; if so, whether a pacific mission will be sent to Afghanistan, on the same lines as that sent to the Dalai Lama at Lhasa, to ascertain the cause of the Amir's altered attitude to the Indian Government; and, in the event of his persistent refusal of the subsidy, what steps will be taken to compel his acceptance.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) The Answer to the Question is in the negative.

Law as to Width of Tyre of loaded Waggons in Ireland.

MR. FFRENCH (Wexford, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Wexford County Council passed a resolution recommending the extension to Ireland of Section 4 of the 24 and 25 Vic., c. 70, regulating the width of tyres of loaded waggons; and whether he will consider the advisability of altering the law as suggested.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The resolution has been received and the suggestion which it contains will be considered.

Compulsory Destruction of Bees Suffering from Foul Brood.

MR. FFRENCH: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the County Wexford Committee of Agriculture and Technical Instruction passed a resolution recommending the introduction of a Bill for the compulsory destruction of bees suffering from foul brood; and whether he will consider the advisability of introducing a Bill for that purpose.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) I would refer to my replies to the similar Questions addressed to me on the 8th and 11th February and 29th March by the hon. Member for South Kerry,[†] to which I have nothing to add.

Impure Irish Whisky.

Mr. FFRENCH: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that farmers' profits in Ireland are considerably reduced, as there is a decreasing demand for malting barley and other cereals used in the production of genuine Irish pot-still whisky owing to the substitution by whisky blenders of patent spirit distilled from cheap foreign commodities for genuine Irish pot-still whisky; and whether the Government will come to the relief of Irish farmers by taking steps to stop this practice.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) There is no direct evidence that farmers' profits are reduced as stated. The matter is engaging, however, the attention of the Department of Agriculture, which will take such action as may appear to be required in order to protect, as far as possible, the interests of Irish growers of cereals used in the production of genuine Irish whisky.

Irish Petty Sessions—Right of Appeal from Sentences.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that in Ireland magistrates at petty sessions can inflict sentences of imprisonment for a period not exceeding one month, with or without hard labour, whereas in England there is a power of appeal from every sentence of magistrates whatever the term of imprisonment may be; whether his attention has been directed to comments from the judicial bench on refusals in recent cases by magistrates to increase sentences in order to enable their decisions to be tested by appeals; and whether he will take steps to assimilate the law in Ireland to the law in England by initiating legislation enabling an appeal to be taken in all cases from magisterial decisions in Ireland.

(*Answered by Mr Wyndham.*) The question of assimilating the law in this respect in the two countries will be considered when a suitable opportunity presents itself.

Recommendations of Royal Commission on Militia and Volunteers.

Sir ERNEST FLOWER (Bradford, W): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether it is proposed to put in force during the present year the recommendations contained in paragraph 58 (y) of the Report of the recent Royal Commission on the Militia and Volunteers.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) There is a misprint in this Question, presumably my hon. friend refers to paragraph 56 (v). It is too soon to make any announcement with respect to the recommendations contained in the Report of the Royal Commission.

Cost of Japanese Army.

Mr. TREVELYAN (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can give the figures of the expenditure upon the Japanese Army for each of the last five years, and the cost per head of the population compared with Great Britain and the leading European nations.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) The Japanese Budget Estimates, as published, for the years named were as follows:—

	£
1899–1900 . . .	5,558,025
1900–1901 . . .	5,293,588
1901–1902 . . .	4,955,635
1902–1903 . . .	4,669,510
1903–1904 . . .	4,217,196

With regard to the cost per head as compared with other nations it is, as previously stated in answer to Questions of a similar nature, impossible to arrive for purposes of comparison at any reliable conclusion as to the actual military expenditure incurred by the various foreign Powers.

[†] See (4) *Debates*, cxxix., 595 and 1030, cxxxii., 982.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Submarine A1—Committee of Inquiry.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether, having regard to the statements made in public by the First Lord as to the loss of Submarine A1, he will now undertake to lay upon the Table the Report of the Committee of Inquiry.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. PRETYMAN, Suffolk, Woodbridge): All Reports of Courts of Inquiry are confidential, and it is not considered desirable to depart from this principle, especially in the case of a submarine. Any information that can be made public can be given to the House during the discussion on Navy Estimates.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: I beg to give notice that on the Navy Estimates I will call attention to the withholding of the Report, and the consequent danger of incorrect and unfortunate impressions being produced.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): Will there be any Court-martial?

MR. PRETYMAN: No, Sir, I believe not.

Enfield Small Arms Factory—Payment of Gratuities to Discharged Workmen.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.): I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether it has been brought to his notice that about 100 men recently discharged from the Small Arms Factory at Enfield have been informed that they cannot receive their gratuity money for at least three weeks after discharge; and whether, in view of his promise to a deputation of these men on 18th May that they should be allowed to remain at work till the gratuity was settled, he will see that these men are paid this gratuity without delay.

*THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Mr BROMLEY-DAVENPORT, Cheshire, Macclesfield): Under the existing system, some considerable delay necessarily occurs before the payment of the gratuity, because the gratuity has to be calculated to the date of leaving work, and cannot, therefore, be paid on that date. I gave no such promise to the deputation as is indicated in the second paragraph of the Question. What I did promise was, that the existing system should be most carefully considered with a view to reducing the delay to the shortest possible period. It is by no means an easy matter, but I hope to be able to secure some improvement upon the existing system.

Manufacture of Rifles—Government and Private Orders.

CAPTAIN NORTON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can state the number of rifles for which orders were placed during last year with private firms and with Government factories respectively, and the cost of the rifle supplied by the contracting firms as compared with the cost of the rifle produced in the Government factories; and whether the amount of work now being done at the Enfield Government Factory is less than that which was done prior to the enlargement of the factory.

*MR. BROMLEY-DAVENPORT: The orders placed for the new pattern rifle since its acceptance are—in the Ordnance Factories for 1903–4, 67,000 new and 50,000 converted, and for 1904–5, 50,000 new and 4,000 converted; with the trade 105,000 new for the two years 1903–05. No conversions are allocated to the trade. The contract price of the new rifle supplied by the trade is £4 10s. The estimated cost of the new rifle supplied by the Ordnance Factories is £3 10s. The work that will be done in the Enfield Factory this year will be more than the average of work done for some years prior to the war.

Military Services in St. Giles' Cathedral, Edinburgh.

The following Question appeared on the Paper:—

MASTER OF ELIBANK (Edinburgh, Midlothian): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether the General Commanding the Forces in Scotland has reported to him the action of Dr. Cameron Lees in forbidding military services to be conducted in St. Giles' Cathedral for Scottish regiments quartered at Edinburgh Castle;

and, if so, whether he will make representations to Dr. Cameron Lees' ecclesiastical superiors in regard to this departure from traditional usage.

On the hon. Member being called upon to put the Question he said: Since placing this Question on the Paper I have received a letter from Dr. Cameron Lees which convinces me that the action of which I complain was due not to him but to the Kirk Session, and as I have no desire to do him an injustice I do not propose to ask the Question.

Military Drafts for India.

*Sir J. DICKSON-POYNDER (Wiltshire, Chippenham): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether a portion of the drafts now being sent to India include men who have less than one year to serve; if so, what is the number of such men already sent and to be sent; and whether he will grant a Return stating the number of such men, the amount of time they will spend in India, and the cost of their transport out and home.

Mr. BROMLEY-DAVENPORT: No drafts are now being sent to India. Orders were issued that no men were to be embarked with less than one year's unexpired service, but, owing to the accident which delayed the "Assaye," when she left port the second time she had on board twenty-two men whose unexpired service was less than one year. No extra cost was entailed owing to the embarkation of these men. The average cost of a soldier's voyage to India is from £7 to £8.

Imperial Yeomanry—Term of Re-engagement.

Sir J. DICKSON-POYNDER: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, in view of the fact that a number of the men in the Imperial Yeomanry who will shortly complete their three years service are willing to re-engage if such re-engagement can be effected annually, but not for another term of three years, he will consider the advisability of so altering the present regulations as to permit of re-engagements for one year.

Mr. BROMLEY DAVENPORT: This matter is at present under consideration.

Dublin Corporation and Soldiers in the Streets.

Mr. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if his attention has been called to a resolution passed by the Dublin Corporation prohibiting soldiers walking the main streets in Dublin, and to the fact that a society called the Cuman na Gaedhael has sent a similar resolution to other public bodies for adoption; and, if so, will he state what action, if any, he intends taking in the matter.

Mr. BROMLEY-DAVENPORT: No report on this matter has been received from the General Officer Commanding, Third Army Corps. The resolution does not appear to have any serious importance, and no action is at present contemplated by the War Office.

Mr. JOSEPH DEVLIN (Kilkenny, N.): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the Irish Temperance League in Belfast recently refused to admit soldiers as members?

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! That does not arise out of the Question.

Mr. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green) was understood to ask if the resolution was not merely aimed at disorderly soldiers and their female companions who indulged in language and conduct of a filthy character.

Mr. BROMLEY-DAVENPORT said he had no knowledge of the motives which led to the passing of the resolution. All he could say was that the War Office did not propose to take any action.

Chinese Labour Limitations in the Transvaal.

Mr. HUNT (Shropshire, Ludlow): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether it is provided under the Transvaal Ordinance that the Chinaman will only be employed in the same class of work as that which was performed by South African natives before the war; and, if not, whether he will take steps to see that this is effected.

The SECRETARY of STATE for the COLONIES (**Mr. Lyttelton**, Warwick and Leamington): The Transvaal Ordinance provides that the Chinese labourers are to be employed only on unskilled labour in the exploitation of minerals, and defines unskilled labour as such labour as is usually performed in mines in the Witwatersrand district by persons belonging to the aboriginal races or tribes of Africa, south of the Equator.

Pay of Chinese Labourers in the Transvaal.

Dr. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he will communicate to Lord Milner the assurance he gave to the House on 21st March that Chinese labourers indentured under the Transvaal Ordinance would receive at least 2s. a day; and whether he will press for the accomplishment of this undertaking.

Mr. LYTTELTON: The hon. Member will see from reference to page 37 of Cd. 2026 that I communicated my statement to Lord Milner. The assurance was given on the best authority, which was that Chinese coolies could not be obtained for lower wages. This information, probably owing to the dislocation of the labour market caused by the war, has proved incorrect. Accordingly, in order to secure the principle which I had in my mind—viz., that Chinese labour should not unfairly compete with or undercut native labour, I have exhaustively discussed the whole question with Lord Milner and have arranged that the Chinaman shall have equality of payment with the native for different classes of work, and full opportunity of taking piecework, by which, Lord Milner informs me, the Chinese will be able to earn considerably more than the average monthly wage. While it is right to protect the South African native from unfair competition, I think no one would desire to inflate the scale of native wages, which are already high, by paying Chinese not only much more than they have proved ready to take, but more than the average standard of Kaffir wages. I trust, therefore, inasmuch as I have fully observed the spirit, that the House will absolve me from fulfilling the letter, of my undertaking,

Dr. MACNAMARA: Are we to understand that the pledge given by the right hon. Gentleman on 21st, March that the Chinese labourer should at least receive 2s. a day. is one which the right hon. Gentleman, in the light of subsequent events, believes cannot be carried out?

Mr. LYTTELTON: I do not say that it cannot be carried out; but I think that in the opinion of all fair-minded men, whether opponents of the measure or not, it would not be desirable to carry it out, because I do not think anybody wishes to give the Chinese higher wages than the Kaffirs. It would tend to raise the scale of Kaffir wages throughout South Africa to the prejudice of agriculture.

Sir JOHN GORST (Cambridge University): Is it not the fact that the minimum wage paid to the Chinese will be lower than the minimun wage of the Kaffir?

Mr. LYTTELTON: No, Sir, that is not the case. Take, say, 100 Kaffirs and 100 Chinese. Measures have been taken to provide that if the 100 Chinese do not, on the average, earn as much as the 100 Kaffirs do—namely, 50s. a month—their wages shall be supplemented.

Sir JOHN GORST: But is it not the fact that the wage paid for the first six months for Chinese labour is 1s. a day, whereas that paid for the first six months for African labour is 1s. 6d. a day.

Mr. LYTTELTON: No, Sir, it is not the fact. The average paid to Chinamen will, I am assured, be at least 50s. a month.

Mr. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.): Will there not be an inducement to the mineowners to employ Kaffirs, because they do more work than the Chinese?

Mr. LYTTELTON: I have taken every possible measure to secure that the interest of the mine-owners shall be to employ natives rather than Chinese. It has been provided that the Chinese shall have equal wages with the native. As the expenses of transit of Chinese are much larger, it is obvious that the interest of the mine-owners will be to employ the Kaffir rather than the Chinese.

SIR HENRY FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.): How is the average wage of the Kaffir to be ascertained. Is it to be the wage before the war, during the war, or the reduced wage since the war?

MR. LYTTELTON: It is substantially the pre-war wage. This was originally 49s. It went down to 30s. It has since risen again to something below 50s.; I think about 47s.

SIR HENRY FOWLER: On what principle is the rate of wages for piecework arrived at.

*MR. SPEAKER: This is becoming a debate on the question of Chinese wages. I think it would be better to put any further Questions on the Paper.

DR. MACNAMARA: What is the minimum wage paid at the present time to the individual Kaffir?

*MR. SPEAKER: I have said that notice should be given of any further Questions.

Gangers and Overseers in the Transvaal Mines.

DR. MACNAMARA: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he will make representations to the Transvaal Government in favour of the employment of white men as gangers and overseers under the Chinese Labour Ordinance, in order that the assurances given by himself and Lord Milner that the adoption of the Ordinance would mean additional employment for white men may tend towards realisation.

MR. LYTTELTON: As I have already pointed out, the terms of the Ordinance seem to me to have been drawn with great care to ensure that there can be no displacement of white labour and that no work hitherto performed by whites can possibly be given to the Chinese. It does not, therefore, appear to me that any such representations are required.

Arrival of Chinese Immigrants at Durban.

MR. WHITLEY (Halifax): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if an advance party of Chinese immigrants has already arrived in Durban for the Transvaal mines; and, if so, whether they are correctly described as overseers to be employed in directing the work of the coolies now on passage to South Africa.

MR. LYTTELTON: I have received no information as to this supposed party of immigrants.

Alleged Forced Labour in the Transvaal Mines for Native Offenders.

MR. WHITLEY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he has now any information confirming or contradicting the statements of the native Chiefs Umzimkulu and Umhalla that natives in the Transvaal mines are convicted for trivial offences, and after the expiry of their sentences are sent, against their will, for six months service in the mines.

MR. LYTTELTON: I am informed by Lord Milner that in no case has a native on discharge from gaol been employed to work for a fresh master. On expiration of his sentence a native is required to complete his service with his registered employer provided the latter desires his return, otherwise the option is given him of seeking a fresh employer or returning home. The statements of these native chiefs appear, therefore, to have been founded upon some misapprehension.

MR. WHITLEY: Will the right hon. Gentleman inquire as to the circumstances which gave rise to this misapprehension on the part of the natives who made the complaint to their chiefs?

[No answer was audible].

Alleged Unrest amongst the Zoutpansberg Natives.

THE MASTER OF ELIBANK: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether any official information has reached him regarding the alleged unrest amongst the natives in the Zoutpansberg district of the Transvaal; and, if not, whether he will make telegraphic inquiries in the matter.

Mr. **LYTTELTON**: I have telegraphed to Lord Milner on the subject but have not yet received his reply.

Chinese Labour in the Straits Settlements.

Mr. TREVELYAN (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he will inquire from the Governor of the Straits Settlements as to whether it is the case that indentured Chinese coolies in that colony decline to work except under foremen and gangers of their own colour.

Mr. LYTTELTON: I am informed by the late Governor that Chinese indentured labourers in the Straits Settlements work on the terms laid down in their indentures, which do not provide that overseers, foremen, or gangers should be exclusively Chinese. Sir F. Swettenham is not aware that any such labourer has ever refused to serve under direction other than Chinese, but, since most of the employers of Chinese indentured labour in the Straits Settlements are themselves Chinese, it is natural that the overseers, gangers, and foremen should, as a rule, be Chinese also.

British Indian Subjects in the Transvaal.

Mr. HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is aware that, in the test case brought by British Indians in the Transvaal Supreme Court, the Chief Justice, with the concurrence of his two colleagues, decided that British Indian subjects are entitled to trade in any part of the Transvaal; and whether he will state what steps are being taken to give effect to this decision by the removal of existing restrictions upon their trade.

Mr. LYTTELTON: I am aware of the decision referred to, and am in communication with Lord Milner upon the subject.

Indian Tea Trade with Persia.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs does the duty now levied in Persia on tea act virtually as a prohibition on the importation of tea from India into Persia; has His Majesty's Minister at Teheran been instructed to make any representations against he duty; and, if so, what has been the the result.

The UNDER-SECRETARY of STATE for FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Earl Percy, Kensington, S.): No, Sir. It appears that the importation of Indian tea into Persia has shown no diminution since the imposition of the new duty.

Brussels Sugar Convention—Colonial Bounty-Fed Sugars.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if, in view of the fact that the Brussels International Sugar Bounties Permanent Commission at its sittings in October last declared that the Russian system as it exists does not give rise to a bounty; that it declared by a vote of eight in the affirmative, against one in the negative, given by Great Britain, that the contracting States have the right to levy on sugared products a surtax higher than that fixed by Article 3 of the Sugar Convention; and that it further decided that in Canada, Australia, and the South African Customs Union sugar bounties exist and fixed the rates of countervailing duties, for Canada at 3·63 francs per 100 kilogrammes on refined sugar, for the South African Customs Union at 2·05 francs per 100 kilogrammes on raw and and 3·89 francs on refined sugar, and for Australia at 9·94 francs per 100 kilogrammes on raw and 5·62 francs on refined sugar; he will state whether His Majesty's Government accept these as binding decisions; and, if so, what course does it propose to take with regard to Russian sugars, to sugared products, and to bounty-fed sugars coming from Canada, South Africa, and Australia.

Earl PERCY: 1. The Permanent Commission at its sittings in October declared that the Russian system does give rise to a bounty. The word "not" in the report of the proceedings just laid before Parliament is an unfortunate typographical error, but the meaning is apparent from the context. In the case of the Customs duties fixed for Australian sugars, the rate 0·94 francs appears in the hon. Member's Question by a similar typographical error as 9·94. 2. The question of the surtax leviable by contracting States on sugared products is still before the Permanent Commission and the discussion has been adjourned to the next session of the Commission. 3. The Sugar Convention was ratified under the explicit declaration that His Majesty's Government would not consent under any circumstances to be bound to penalise bounty-fed sugar imported into the United Kingdom from any of the self-governing Colonies.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Will the Government take steps to secure English manufacturers against the unfair competition of bounty-fed foreign sugar products.

EARL PERCY intimated that between now and the next sitting of the Commission in November the matter would be considered. He had no information that any foreign bounty-fed sugar products were being imported.

Glasgow Milk Supply—Sore Throat Epidemic.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he is aware that the epidemic of sore throat which recently broke out at the Belvedere Hospital, Glasgow, is like that at Woking last autumn, and at Finchley early this year, attributable to the milk taken from cows out of health; and, seeing that Dr. Chalmers, the medical officer of health for Glasgow, states that the outbreak in that city is due to teat eruption in the stock at the farm from which the milk supply is obtained, will he consider the expediency of introducing at an early date such legislation as may be necessary to insure the occasional examination by a veterinary surgeon of all cows kept for the purposes of a public dairy.

THE SECRETARY TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. GRANT LAWSON, Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk): The President has no jurisdiction in Scotland with regard to sanitary matters, but he has seen a report of Dr. Chalmers as to the epidemic of sore throat at the Belvedere Hospital, Glasgow. With regard to the suggestion for legislation my right hon. friend wishes me to repeat the Answer which he gave to the hon. Member's Question on 29th March last, that he had caused the suggestion to be noted, but that he could not promise to introduce legislation on the subject during the present session.†

Poor Law Inspectors' Returns of Expenditure.

MR. ATHERLEY-JONES (Durham, N.W.): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether his attention has been called to the fact that the Poor Law Inspectors' Returns of Expenditure which are sent half-yearly to boards of guardians omit the following matters, namely; workhouse loan, maintenance of lunatics in asylums, and the expenses incidental to Poor Law relief; and, if so, whether he will direct that in future the above-named items of expenditure shall be included in the Returns.

MR. GRANT LAWSON: It is usual for an inspector to furnish the boards of guardians in his district with periodical statements containing some particulars as to pauperism and expenditure on poor relief in the district. This is a voluntary act on the part of the inspector, and it is in his discretion to determine what amount of information the statement shall contain. The President will, however, cause the suggestion made in the Question to be brought under the notice of the inspectors.

Motor Traffic Regulations.

MR. GARDNER (Berkshire, Wokingham): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether, having regard to the fact that the evidence given before the Departmental Committee on Motor Cars was only published on 4th June he will cause a circular letter to be addressed to the county councils, intimating that he will consider representations, should they desire to make any, upon the recommendations of the Committee; and whether he will allow a reasonable time for representations to be made before making Regulations under Section 12 of The Motor-Car Act, 1903.

MR. GRANT LAWSON: My right hon. friend wishes me to say that he is strongly urged to issue these Regulations as soon as possible, and is reluctant, therefore, to take the course which the hon. Member suggests. He will, however, consider whether it will be practicable to afford representatives of local authorities concerned an opportunity of seeing the draft of the Regulations.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxxxii., 979.

Transvaal War Contribution.

Mr. WHITLEY: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequr if he has received any representations from any of the guarantors of the Transvaal War Contribution asking that the arrangement made with the Member for West Birmingham may be reconsidered; and, if so, what reply has been given.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.): The Answer to the Question is in the negative.

General Blake's Widow's Documents.

Mr. P. J. O'BRIEN (Tipperary, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, with reference to the property of the deceased widow of General Robert Dudley Blake which is in possession of the Treasury, if he will give the name mentioned in the document found amongst the deceased lady's papers purporting to be that of her father, for the information of a person who may be able to identify the person so named; and whether, with the view of giving all concerned the fullest information, he will see his way to submit for inspection the other documents in question bearing on the intention of the deceased as to the disposal of her property, had she been prepared to make a will.

The FINANCIAL SECRETARY of the TREASURY (Mr. Victor Cavendish, Derbyshire, W.): If the person interested will communicate with the Solicitor to the Treasury, such information as can properly be given will be afforded to him.

Geological Survey of Devonshire.

Mr. SOARES (Devonshire, Barnstaple): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether he is aware that there is no complete geological map of the county of Devon in existence of a later date than the year 1840, when a survey of the county was made by Sir H. de la Beche; and whether, having regard to the quantity of rock in Devonshire suitable for building and ornamental purposes, he will, in the interests of the development of the trade of the county, order an immediate and complete geological survey.

The PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY to the BOARD of EDUCATION (Sir William Anson, Oxford University): Since 1840, portions of the county of Devon have been re-surveyed on a scale of six inches to a mile, and the plan upon which the survey is working contemplates the entire re-survey of the county on this scale. New series one-inch maps based upon this re-survey have already been published for part of the county; and for another part one-inch maps are now being published, which embody information of a much more recent date than that contained in the maps of 1840. Special attention is being given to the economic aspect suggested in the Question.

Cornahilta School Teacher.

Mr. JORDAN (Fermanagh, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the fact that the Commissioners of National Education, Ireland, have refused promotion to Mrs. M. K. Dick, principal teacher of the Cornahilta National School (8 and 14864), Billeck, county Fermanagh; and whether, seeing that about twenty other teachers, under similar conditions, have been promoted, he will inquire into the case with a view to giving this teacher promotion.

The CHIEF SECRETARY for IRELAND (Mr. Wyndham, Dover): I am informed that the case of this teacher has been dealt with in accordance with the rules governing all such cases, and that she will not be eligible for promotion for some years.

Lough Erne Drainage Charges.

Mr. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): On behalf of the hon. Member for North Fermanagh, I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will consider the advisability of including the Lough Erne drainage charges within the scope of inquiry about to be made in regard to Trinity College rents, having regard to the fact that many landlords whose lands adjoin Lough Erne have such heavy drainage charges to pay that they cannot sell on favourable terms to their tenants.

MR. WYNDHAM: I am unable to say that an investigation of the matters referred to would come within the scope of inquiry by the Commission which has been appointed by the Lord-Lieutenant. It will be for the Commissioners to determine this point. The terms of reference have already been announced, and I am not prepared to enlarge them.

Mr. Hurley's Killarney Estate.

MR. MURPHY (Kerry, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the estate of John C. D. Hurley, near Killarney, was under the control of the Land Judge's Court in Ireland, and a sale effected to a majority of the tenants a few years ago under an order of the Court, and that the farms occupied by Jeremiah Sheehan, Eugene M'Carthy, Patrick Lyne, Michael Mahony, and Thomas Talbot have not yet been sold to the tenants owing to the conditions sought to be imposed as to turbary rights; and, if so, will he take steps to effect a sale in these cases.

MR. WYNDHAM: In the case of this estate the Estates Commissioners have issued a request to the Land Judge with a view to purchase under the 7th Section of the Act of 1903. The Commissioners will make an offer for purchase as soon as the necessary undertakings have been signed by the tenants. The offer will include the turbary, which will be divided among the tenants in accordance with the suggestions of the inspector.

Warden Estate, Reinstatement of Evicted Tenant.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in view of the fact that Michael J. Sheehan was evicted from his farm of Ardshillane, on the Warden Estate, he can state why he has been refused reinstatement.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Estates Commissioners have received no application in respect of the sale of this estate. An application for reinstatement has been received from the evicted tenant named and will be duly considered.

MR. BOLAND: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have received an application from Mary Currane, of Gurtramough, on the Warden Estate, Sneem, for reinstatement on her farm, in view of the fact that Colonel Warden has given an undertaking that all evicted tenants will be reinstated, and whether, seeing that Mary Currane is now returning from America, steps will be taken to secure her reinstatement; and can he state whether the farm is occupied at present; if so, by whom, and what fine has been paid to the landlord.

MR. WYNDHAM: An application for reinstatement has been received in this case, and will be considered in due course by the Estates Commissioners. The evicted holding is in the hands of the landlord and, at present, is in charge of a caretaker.

MR. BOLAND: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Henry Aldworth of Gerah, on the Warden Estate, has been refused reinstatement in his farm, in spite of the fact that he is next-of-kin to Patrick Dorohy, Gerah, now in America, whose permission he has for occupying this farm, and can he state the reason for such refusal; and whether the farm is at present occupied by a caretaker who is proposed to be the future tenant.

MR. WYNDHAM: No application for reinstatement has been received from this man by the Estates Commissioners.

Imprisonment of Roscommon County Councillor.

MR. HAYDEN (Roscommon, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to a resolution recently passed by the Roscommon County Council, condemning the action of a local bench of magistrates in sentencing a member of the council to two short terms of imprisonment, without the option of a fine, on a charge for which usually a fine is imposed; whether he is aware that the charge was heard in the absence of the defendant; and, if so, whether, in view of a recent utterance of County Court Judge Adams to the same effect, he will consider the advisability of altering the law in order to give an appeal in every case from a sentence of imprisonment imposed by a petty sessions tribunal.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The defendant was convicted on two separate charges of permitting horses, his property, to be cruelly tortured by working them in an unfit state. When the case was called on the 14th May his solicitor applied for an adjournment for a fortnight, to suit the convenience of the defendant, who was unable to be present on that date. The application was granted. On the adjournment he failed to appear, and the solicitor who appeared for him on the first occasion stated he had no instructions. The principal witness for the prosecution stated it was the worst case of cruelty he had ever seen. The defendant was sentenced to two terms of imprisonment of seven days without hard labour. The presiding magistrate, in delivering judgment, observed that the sentence was the lightest possible consistent with the administration of justice. The question of assimilating the law in Ireland and England in respect of appeals is one that might be considered in the event of the introduction of legislation dealing with Petty Sessions Courts.

Dublin Cycle Stealing Case.

Mr. MOONEY (Dublin County, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if his attention has been called to the remarks made by Mr. Drury, one of the Dublin metropolitan divisional magistrates, on the preliminary hearing of the case against the man Ferns, charged with stealing bicycles, as to the extraordinary innocence of the purchasers in purchasing expensive machines for £2 or £3; and whether, seeing that this man has now been convicted, and that counsel stated in Court that the G Division of the Dublin Metropolitan Police had fulfilled their duty, and had sent lists of all stolen bicycles to all the Royal Irish Constabulary Barracks, what steps he intends to take against those members of that body who have purchased stolen bicycles from the man Ferns.

Mr. WYNDHAM: Lists of the stolen bicycles were not sent to the police stations at which four of them were purchased by members of the force. The Inspector-General has made full inquiry and is satisfied that none of the constables concerned had any suspicion that they had purchased stolen property.

Irish Board of Education — Attendance Rule.

Mr. SHEEHY (Meath, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the new rule of the Board of National Education, reducing the average attendance, is yet in force; and, if so, what are its terms.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The hon. Member does not appear to have seen my replies to previous Questions on this subject, to which I have nothing at present to add.

Belfast Valuation Appeals.

Mr. JOSEPH DEVLIN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, (1) whether he has considered and determined upon the representations made last month by deputation and correspondence from the Belfast Borough Council and others to delay proceeding with the hearing of appeals against the new general valuation of the city of Belfast, (2) is he aware that some of these appeals have been since heard and decided, (3) and that a number of appellants propose to contest before the superior Courts the new principles of establishing the high valuation introduced into procedure in Ireland for the first time, (4) and whether, in view of the fact that the Select Committee on Irish Valuation has recommended a change in the tribunal for hearing appeals from the Commissioner of Valuation, he is prepared to advise that the hearing of these Belfast appeals be deferred until the recommendations of the Select Committee are carried into effect.

Mr. WYNDHAM: I have considered the representations referred to in the Question, but with the exception of that relating to the immediate operation of the annual revision which is now before the Law Officers I do not find anything in them to justify the postponement of the revaluation. I am aware that appeals to the Superior Courts are in contemplation, but as several cases have already been decided by the Recorder and others are awaiting his decision it is not practicable for me to interfere.

MR. JOSEPH DEVLIN asked if the right hon. Gentleman was aware that the Belfast County Council had passed a resolution declaring that if the decision were persisted in it would operate injuriously on the citizens?

MR. WYNDHAM: If the resolution referred only to the annual revision, that is provided for; if to the larger question, there are two opinions on that.

Case of Constable Anderson.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland on what grounds Constable Anderson was dismissed from the Irish Constabulary, and by what authority his case was inquired into when the decision to dismiss him was arrived at; on what representations was his case reconsidered; what was the tribunal which conducted the further inquiry; and on what ground and by what authority was Constable Anderson reinstated in the force.

MR. WYNDHAM: Constable Anderson was dismissed from the force upon consideration of the evidence investigated and reported upon by a Court of Inquiry. There were three charges preferred against him, namely, (1) having improperly entered licensed premises when on duty, (2) having used obscene language to a boy, and (3) having been guilty of grossly immoral conduct with a young woman. In the opinion of the Court of Inquiry the first and third charges were, and the second charge was not, sustained. I wish to state that the Court of Inquiry was convened on the initiative of the police. A suggestion, which I have seen, that it was convened at the instance of myself, or of Sir Antony MacDonnell, is absolutely without foundation. The constable was removed from the force on 8th December.

MR. DILLON: By whose authority?

MR. WYNDHAM: I am coming to that. The members of the Royal Irish Constabulary hold office at pleasure. They can, therefore, in point of law, be dismissed arbitrarily by the Crown without reason given or cause assigned. Court of Inquiry do not resemble either Civil Courts or Courts-Martial, but there is the closest resemblance in character and function between them and Courts of Inquiry authorised by the Army Orders for the purposes of that service. In Simmons on Court-Martial, at page 334, it is stated that "A Court of Inquiry is not in any light to be considered as a judicial body. A Court of Inquiry is rather a council than a Court, of which any officer in command may take advantage to assist him in arriving at a correct conclusion on any subject on which it may be expedient for him to be thoroughly informed." The Lord-Lieutenant's function is not confined to confirming the finding of the Court of Inquiry, or disregarding it only in those cases in which there is no legal evidence to support it. His function extends further and enables him to review the evidence, differ from the conclusions, and disregard the opinion. Fresh evidence was subsequently supplied by the solicitor who had appeared for Constable Anderson, on the third and most serious charge. A careful examination of the case in the light of the fresh evidence led me to a conviction that the evidence originally tendered, even if absolutely truthful, was consistent with the innocence of the constable. The Inspector-General considered, and I agree, that the Court returned a true verdict on the evidence before it. But a new fact was brought to light, *i.e.*, a certificate signed by two doctors, to the effect that the young woman concerned was a virgin many months after the events dealt with in the evidence. Briefly, all turned, in my opinion, on whether the action witnessed was an attempt at seduction or consistent with innocence. After consultation with the Inspector-General, he and I came to the conclusion that the more favourable interpretation was at least as probable as the interpretation placed on the evidence by the Court who had not the medical certificate before them. On my advice, after I had conferred with the Inspector-General on the import of the fresh evidence, the ex-constable was reinstated in the force on the 19th March by the Lord-Lieutenant.

Mr. DILLON: On that statement I want to ask two Questions—(1) whether the fresh evidence brought forward was submitted to any tribunal before the Chief Secretary gave his decision; and (2) to point out that the Chief Secretary has not answered the very important part of the Question, "On what representation the case was reconsidered."

Mr. WYNDHAM: The case was reconsidered because representations from certain quarters—it is quite immaterial from what quarters—were made to the effect that a certificate had been sent in signed by two doctors. This certificate alone may not in the first instance have been precisely evidence, but I conferred with those who advised me on the subject—namely, the Law Officers, and I came to the conclusion, and the Inspector-General came to the conclusion, that it put altogether another complexion on the whole facts previously stated. Then the hon. Member asks a further Question as to whether there was a tribunal. No, no tribunal. An inquiry is not a Court of Law.

Mr. DILLON: I ask leave to ask two further Questions: Whether the representations to which the hon. Member refers were representations made by Members of this House, and secondly, in reversing the decision of the Constabulary Court, why he did not consider it necessary to submit the evidence on which he reversed the decision to another Court of Inquiry.

Mr. WYNDHAM: I consider that those certificates of two respectable practitioners were sufficient reasons for reconsidering he whole case. I consider whether the representations came from Members of this House or other parties is quite immaterial. Many representations on various questions came to me from all quarters. I tak the whole responsibility for the decision arrived at.

Mr. DILLON: I really must press the right hon. Gentleman for an Answer to a simple Question, namely, on what ground he did not refer the fresh evidence placed before him—which I decline to accept as evidence until it is examined—why he did not refer the allegations made to him, from whatever quarter, to a fresh Court of Inquiry before he reversed the decision of the first Court?

Mr. WYNDHAM: I have answered the hon. Member. I may be right or I may be wrong, I consider that the certificate sent in by the solicitor for Anderson and signed by two respectable practitioners, was a fact upon which I was quite competent to form an opinion.

Mr. DILLON: Did you see the practitioners and examine them?

Mr. WYNDHAM: If the hon. Member can prove they do not exist and are bogus he can accuse me of an error of judgment. But I know they do exist.

Mr. DILLON: Did you see and examine them?

Mr. WYNDHAM: No.

Mr. SLOAN: May I ask who was it preferred the original charge against the constable?

Mr. WYNDHAM: Complaints reached me——

***Mr. SPEAKER**: Order! The Question has been fully answered. Any fresh Questions should be put down.

Mr. LUNDON (Limerick, E.) rose to put a further Question.

***Mr. SPEAKER**: Order, order! I have said the Question has been fully answered.

Mr. LUNDON: My Question is very important.

*MR. SPEAKER: I am not questioning that, but the Question on the Paper has been fully answered, and notice must be given of any further Questions.

MR. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): May I ask, arising out of the Answer of the Chief Secretary——

*MR. SPEAKER: The Question has been fully answered.

MR. MACVEAGH: No, Sir.

[The matter then dropped.]

Insurance of Irish Public Buildings.

MR. MURNAGHAN (Tyrone, Mid): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he can state whether any Government or public buildings in Ireland are insured against risks by fire; and, if so, whether they are insured with British or with Irish insurance companies; and will he state the total amounts annually paid for insurance premiums to British and Irish insurance companies respectively.

MR. VICTOR CAVENDISH: As a general rule public buildings are not insured by Government against fire, but two buildings in Ireland which are leased for public purposes are insured under the lease, one with a British and one with an Irish company. The premiums are £1 10s. and 15s. per annum respectively.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.): What is the name of the Irish company?

MR. VICTOR CAVENDISH: The Patriotic Insurance Company.

Food Supply Commission.

MR. RUNCIMAN (Dewsbury): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury what are the terms of reference to the Royal Commission on the Supply of Food and Raw Materials in time of war; and whether these terms cover an inquiry into the supply of raw cotton in time of peace.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): The terms of reference to the Royal Commission on the Supply of Food and Raw Materials were, "To inquire into the conditions affecting the importation of food and raw material into Great Britain and Ireland and into the amount of the reserve of such supplies existing at any given period, and to advise whether it is desirable to adopt any means in addition to the maintenance of a strong Fleet by which such supplies shall be better secured and violent fluctuations avoided."

MR. RUNCIMAN: Will the right hon. Gentleman say whether those terms cover an inquiry into the supply of raw cotton in time of peace.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No, Sir; it is not for me to interpret the reference to the Commission. The Commission itself must do that.

Great Britain, Russia, and Persia.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury are any negotiations being carried on between His Majesty's Government and the Government of Russia for a treaty with regard to Persia, on the same principles as those on which the recent Anglo-French Agreement was concluded, with reference to Egypt, Morocco, and Siam; has any correspondence passed on the subject; and can any Papers be laid.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The answer to my hon. friend is in the negative.

Committee of Privileges.

*MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury when does he propose to have a Motion made for the nomination of Members of the Committee of Privileges appointed on the first day of the present session; and, in view of the possibility of questions of privilege arising unexpectedly and suddenly which might with advantage be referred by the House to that Committee, can he undertake that this nomination shall shortly be proceeded with.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The House will, perhaps, recollect that my desire has been that, when an question of privilege arises, we should have some machinery for at once and automatically referring it to a Select Committee, and that only after such Select Committee has considered and reported on the subject the House should, if it thinks fit, take up the question. I have not been able to carry that principle into effect, but I think the suggestion of my hon. friend (the reference of such questions to the Committee of Privileges appointed on the first day of the session), although it does not go the whole length, is in that direction, and I propose, therefore, to put down the names of the Committee referred to.

*Mr. GIBSON BOWLES: It was my intention to carry out the proposal of the right hon. Gentleman as he now states it.

Money Resolutions.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he anticipates any further legislation this session involving new expenditure; if so, whether he will undertake to lay before the House, when the money Resolution is proposed in Committee of Ways and Means, an estimate of the amount of such expenditure; and further, whether he will, in future, place the terms of the Resolution on the Paper so that they may be known to Members before the Resolution is moved.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I think experience has shown that it is impossible to ask a Minister in charge of a Bill in which there happens to be a money clause to give any estimate, worth having, to the House as to the actual expense the clause may involve. If we are to alter the existing system of dealing with money proposals in a Bill it should be in the direction of simplifying or abolishing that procedure rather than of making it more elaborate. It would not, therefore, be expedient to depart from the immemorial practice of the House.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON: Will there be any further legislation involving new expenditure?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I cannot give any pledge as to legislation this session.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): I wish to ask about Thursday's arrangements and the main business for next week; I believe there is no great race meeting to necessitate the taking of Bills of small importance.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I am sorry the right hon. Gentleman regards the Scotch Education Bill as a matter of such small importance that it requires an apology for taking it. I will state next week's business to-morrow. With regard to Thursday next the postponement of the Vote for the salary of the Secretary of State for War immediately after he has made his statement on proposals with regard to Army reorganisation, would be inconvenient to those who desire to speak on the proposals and to ask Questions concerning them. But I promised the right hon. Gentleman not to ask the Committee to come to a decision next Thursday. If the discussion does not occupy the whole evening Votes 9 and 10 of the Army Estimates will be taken.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES: Will the right hon. Gentleman consider the desirability of continuing the debate on the Foreign Office Vote? We have not yet discussed the Sugar Convention.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I cannot promise to take the Foreign Office Vote on Thursday so as to allow further discussion on the Sugar Bounty question. That Vote is never concluded until towards the close of the session, because important questions may always arise.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware of the widespread anxiety in Ireland for the discussion of the Labourers Bill. Will he take it at any early day?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I am most anxious to forward the Irish Labourers Bill and the other Irish measures to which the Government is pledged, but cannot at present arrange when they shall be taken.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: The pledge of last session when the portions of the

Land Bill dealing with this subject were deleted to facilitate its passing will not be fulfilled by postponement of legislation till the dog days.

MR. WHITLEY: Has the right hon. Gentleman any statement to make with regard to the Finance Bill? He promised one.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I have said I will make a statement to-morrow as to the business for next week.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Order read.

*MR. SPEAKER: I have to deal with the two Instructions on the Paper. Each of them proposes to extend the Bill to England and Wales. But legislation upon Scottish Education has always been upon different lines, and regulated by different Acts to those relating to English Education. The Instructions are therefore out of order.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[MR. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 3:—

MR. THOMAS SHAW (Hawick Burghs) moved that the consideration of the clause be postponed. He said he did not do so in any sense because he was hostile to the measure, but the fact was that since the Bill had been read a second time it had been very considerably toned down by the Government. Clause 3 provided for the creation of school board districts in Scotland in lieu of the existing parochial school boards. On the Second Reading of the Bill it was explained by more than one hon. Member that they were particularly anxious upon the subject of the area for which the school boards in Scotland were to be established. There was a strong feeling among them that nothing should be done by the enlargement of the area which would destroy the local interest in regard to education. From that point of view he looked with some interest to the proposals of the Government, and he found that it was intended to move the deletion of Clauses 20, 21, 22, and 23, which dealt with the appointment of managing committees in the local parochial areas. The point was whether that proposal did not substantially mean that local control over education was to be ended for ever in Scotland. Personally, he was quite sure that that was not the desire of the Government, and he proposed to ask the Secretary for Scotland if he would be good enough in connection with these proposed deletions to explain to the House what were really the intentions of the Government. The opinion of large sections of the House was that if they were to destroy local contact with education in the various parochial areas it would be a serious mischief to the cause of education.

He might say in regard to Clause 3 that the districts which it was proposed to create by it might be divided into three classes. First, there were the workable, sizable districts; secondly, there were the unworkable districts in point of size; and thirdly, there were the unworkable districts in point of population. In regard to the latter two classes he proposed to call the attention of the right hon. Gentleman to one or two illustrations. For instance, let them take the districts which were unworkable in point of size. There was Sutherlandshire, which was one of the largest areas in Scotland, and apparently the school board district in that case was to cover the entire county. Now the area comprised 1,296,000 acres, there was in it a population of over 20,000, and the valuation was £93,000, and it was manifest that if Clause 3 of the Bill were passed in the form in which it now stood, and if no further provision were made for securing the representation of local opinion, Sutherlandshire would be substantially unrepresented in school board matters. There would, in fact, be no popular element at all. Then he came to Ross and Cromarty. Mid-Ross gave them another illustration of the difficulty of dealing with this subject. There they had a population of 13,000, and an area of 670,000 acres, a district which they would see was absolutely unworkable from that point of view. Now he would come to instances of the unworkable character of districts in point of population. The first case to which he would ask attention was that of the Middle Ward of Lanark. There they had a population of 179,000. The Middle Ward was the centre of a very important industrial district, and if the whole area was to be limited under Clause 3 to be managed by one board without any arrangement for devolution there would be an utter absence of local control. He thought the House was entitled to know what were the intentions of the Government in this matter. Then there was another matter which was not perhaps strictly relevant, but it was also important, and that was, what was to be the attitude of the Government in regard to payment of the expenses of local representatives? He could understand how that question might not arise very sharply if local management committees were to be kept up, but the Government had cut four or five clauses out of their Bill—clauses dealing with local management committees, and therefore it was very essential to know what was to be substituted for them.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the consideration of Clause 3 be postponed."—(*Mr. Thomas Shaw.*)

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire) said he had no objection whatever to the hon. and learned Gentleman making that Motion in order to ask specific questions, but he thought the House would see that so far from making out any case for the postponement of the consideration of Clause 3, his arguments had accentuated the absolute necessity of settling the clause before they proceeded with any other portion of the Bill. The hon. and learned Gentleman had made a statement to the effect that since the Second Reading of the Bill it had been recast to a very considerable extent by the Government. But he would like to remind the House of what he said on the Second Reading. They would remember that on that occasion, speaking of the management clauses, he said the desire was to secure the maintenance of local interest in the schools, and to ascertain what was the general opinion of Scotland in regard to this question. He had had a good many representations made to him on the subject, and he had gathered that the general feeling was in favour of the whole matter being left in the hands of the elected school boards to make the arrangements for proper local management. That was the purport of the Amendments which he had placed upon the Paper. He had thought it convenient to put down in his own name Amendments which would carry out that view, although they embodied the words of Amendments of which notice had been given by other hon. Members, as he thought it would be more convenient to the House to know which Amendments the Government were prepared to accept in that matter. As he had said, he had received innumerable representations on this question, and the hon. and learned Member might take it from him that to the best of his judgment the very great majority of those representations were in favour of trusting to the school boards to see that local managers were provided. There was absolutely no intention on his part to suggest that there should be no local managers, and he believed himself that the school boards were the last people in the world not to remember that local management was necessary. Therefore, he had put down on the Paper Amendments the whole object of which was to indicate that he was prepared to accept Amendments put down by certain other hon. Members. That, he believed, was the only pertinent question which the hon. Member had asked him. Of course, he could not say precisely what the decision of the Government was to be upon other matters until he had had the advantage, which he hoped to have, of gathering the opinion of the House generally in the course of the discussions. He, therefore, trusted that they would be allowed to proceed with the consideration of Clause 3, which fixed the educational districts, without any further debate.

MR. BUCHANAN (Perthshire, E.) said that on Friday last a considerable number of very important Amendments were put on the Paper by the Secretary for Scotland. Those Amendments affected Clause 3, and substantially altered the whole framework of the Bill. There were other Amendments of equal importance affecting the managing committees. The Secretary for Scotland was aware that one general objection taken to the Bill was that it largely decreased the power of the local authorities, and at the same time decreased also the influence which local opinion might possibly exercise in the management of education throughout the length and breadth of Scotland. Putting it shortly, hon. Members were afraid that owing to that idea, owing to the proposal for co-ordination in primary education, the influence of localities was being sacrificed for the more remote interest of secondary and technical education. It was clear that the Amendments which had been put on the Paper by the Secretary for Scotland were in a direction which a large number of Scotch Members viewed with considerable suspicion and dislike, and they wanted a general statement as to the consequences of the batch of Amendments which had been put down, because they desired to know how far they went in the direction of further centralisation, and of the diminution of local popular control. The right hon. Gentleman had told them that he had merely put them on the Paper as signifying his agreement with Amendments which had been put down by other Members of the House in a similar direction, but he would like the right hon. Gentleman to inform him how it would have been possible for hon. Members who agreed with the Bill as it originally was drafted to have indicated that agreement with it. They could not have put Amendments down on the Paper, and, therefore, he did not see how the right hon. and learned Gentleman could have gathered the real feeling of the House on the subject. Though some of them might be content, with regret, to allow the serious diminution of popular control, he did not think they were prepared to go to the extent suggested in the Amendments in the direction of centralising the general educational control in councils or large districts in Scotland.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee) said he thought that the Secretary for Scotland had shown undue querulousness in regard to this Motion.

Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: I was not querulous, all I wanted to point out was that I could not see any possible use in postponing the consideration of the clause.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON said that the right hon. Gentleman had put down last Friday a number of Amendments which constituted a considerable limitation of the Bill and he had absolutely excised a number of the clauses. He had told them he did so in consequence of representations he had had from Members of the House and from numbers of local authorities. They were quite willing to accept that statement, but surely that was a sufficient reason for their asking for further information as to the real intentions of the Government before they proceeded with the consideration of that clause. The right hon. Gentleman ought not to grumble at having an opportunity at this stage of explaining what he proposed to do. There was one point upon which they certainly desired further explanations. The present Act made it compulsory upon school boards to create local bodies of management; that power was now to disappear altogether.

Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: Under the original scheme of the Bill it was proposed that in the enumerated districts there should be the old faculty clause borrowed from the Act of 1872 allowing them to appoint managers if they chose, but in the non-enumerated districts there was the necessity for appointing managers who were of necessity to a certain extent composed of members of parish councils. He gathered that the general opinion was in favour of giving the new school boards a free hand. It had been a question of draftsmanship, but the four clauses which it was proposed to omit had been, as a matter of fact, put into one general clause, giving a faculty to all districts to appoint managers.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON said that was precisely the information they wanted to elicit. He took it that the amended Clause 19 embodied practically the whole of the other clauses which were now to be omitted.

Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: Yes.

Question put, and negatived.

Mr. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid.) then moved as an Amendment to Clause 3 to leave out all after the word "for" in line 16 down to the end of line 3 in page 2 with the view of inserting the words "every parish in Scotland." He said the object of the Amendment was to raise at this stage the question of changing the existing parish area and substituting for it the areas fixed in the Bill. He quite admitted that there had been hitherto a very great consensus of opinion in Scotland openly expressed in favour of wider areas. But if they went more deeply into the views of the community they would find that there were many in Scotland who objected altogether to the effect of the change made by abolishing school boards and establishing wider areas in their place. He had not had an opportunity on the Second Reading of speaking on the Bill, and therefore, he took that, the first opportunity, of expressing his views in regard to this question of dealing with the existing school board districts. He would not be daunted from expressing his views on the question by any feeling that probably there might be an overwhelming opinion against him on the subject. He thought he could show some very good reasons for having the parish area continued in Scotland. The parish area had existed for centuries. It existed long before the Reformation, and it had continued to be not merely the educational area, but also the parochial board of management area. Everything relating to the social life of the people was involved in the parish area in Scotland. Then again, they found that the parish area was the area which, having worked for centuries, had become almost like a family peculiarity of itself. It had its own hereditary characteristics, and they would find in Scotland that the people in one parish differed from the people in another. They would find distinct characteristics belonging to each, because of that hereditary state which had grown up for centuries. Let them take what had occurred in the matter of education. The parent had generally assisted in the preliminary work of educating his child, and it was not infrequently the case that before the child was sent to school it was able to read a chapter from the Bible. Then there had been a close relationship between the parent and the teacher, and the teacher, knowing the parent, took great interest in the child, while the parent on his part gave assistance in seeing that the home lessons were learned. In England they did not find anything of the sort. The parents did not take a personal interest in the education of their children. On the contrary, they sent the children to school when they were about three years of age, and they seemed to consider that it was the duty of the teacher alone to look after the educational training. When the Act of 1872 was passed, the principle upon which it was based was the continuation of the parish system of education which had worked so well for centuries in Scotland. Therefore it was that school boards were established for every parish in Scotland so as to keep up the local interest in the work. As the parish increased in size, of course there could not be that close intercourse between parent and teacher which had existed in the olden times when the population was scantier, and so school boards were elected and the parents secured their representation on that body. School boards, it would be remembered, were elected for every parish, and that was the constitutional method adopted to secure the representation of the parents in the management of the schools, and in the communication with the teachers. That was the essence of the Act of 1872 which it was now proposed to displace. The great secret of success in Scotch education had been the close relationship between the parent and the school, and it was in that respect that he feared this Bill would fail.

Then there was the question of compulsory attendance in Scotland. There was a feeling that it was the local men, representing the community, who enforced compulsory attendance. If they withdrew the influence of the parent in the parish school, as the Bill proposed, the parents would cease to have that special interest in the school which they had under the existing system. The Bill proposed that so many parishes should be grouped together, and that the management of all the schools should be centred in one authority. That would immediately loosen the control, attachment, and interests of the parents of a parish in the parish school. Not only that, but it would loosen and weaken the interest of the ratepayers in the management of the schools. Under the Bill, a parish would not have the management of its own schools. It would be assessed as before, and pay very much the same amount; but the schools would be managed by a combination in which the direct representative of the parish might only be one in six; and he might be out-voted by his colleagues in a matter which concerned his parish and his parish only. At present, the parishes had Home Rule as far as education was concerned; and each parish might travel as fast or as slow as it liked without being trammelled in the slightest degree by the views of outsiders. He looked upon the Bill as a retrograde measure from first to last; and he believed its effect would be to weaken the interest both of the ratepayers and the parents with reference to the parish schools. It might be said that the direct representative of the parish would have a part in the management of schools in other parishes; but what consolation was it to a man to know that the affairs of his parish were to be managed by others and that he would have a share in managing the affairs of other parishes? That would be no consolation.

Then with referene to the salaries of teachers, supposing there was a school which was anxious to progress, which was different from the schools surrounding it, and which was willing to pay for increased educational power, progress in future would not depend on the representative of that particular school but on the five outsiders who were on the board of management; and, as they would be taxed for any increase, they would not see the benefit of increasing the grant from the common fund for the benefit of a school in one parish only. The tendency would be to hamper the schools who wished to get forward. It was also said that one effect of the large area would be the promotion of teachers; but where was the hope of preferment? It might be that there would be hope of preferment for the lazy man, who had no ability, and who would be promoted automatically by rotation. But, from the educational point of view, that would not be as convenient as the existing system. At the present moment, any teacher in Scotland could stand as a candidate for a position under any school board. There was no restriction or limit, and the result was that men of ability had the whole country open to them; and, in that way, talent was able to exercise its due influence. But what would happen if the Bill were passed? Every school board would be a close corporation, and every district would have to promote its own teachers; and, if any outsider were appointed, he would have to start at the bottom and work his way upwards. Look at the position in which a school, willing to pay for education, would be placed. If the position of chief teacher were vacant, the school board would say that the next man should be promoted. The parish might say that they did not want that man, that they wanted to select a teacher for themselves, and not a man who was merely promoted because he was there. After all, promotion was no test of merit. But, under the Bill, the parish could not select a teacher for itself, and, therefore, the parish would lose all interest in its schools if the management were given over to a majority who did not represent the parish at all.

When it was known that an Education Bill was to be introduced for Scotland, there was a great deal of uneasiness, having regard to what had happened in England, lest the school boards should be abolished because they were not rating authorities. But the conditions were exactly the same in Scotland as in England. The school board sent the precept to the local rating authority, and that authority collected the money. It was said by the Prime Minister that they could not have a school board as the education authority, because it was not representative of the ratepayers; and in the case of England it was laid down that the rating authority and the managers should be the same persons. Surely a principle such as that should apply to the whole of the United Kingdom. Yet the Government had decided that the school boards should be abolished in England, but should continue in Scotland. The explanation was that the Government had to advance arguments to suit the exigencies of the moment, which had no foundation whatever in principle. Under the Bill there would be this anomaly. The rating authority would be the parish, and the managing authority would be another body. His experience, however, was that such matters in this House were not decided by argument, but by a Party vote in the division lobbies. The larger area would not have that peculiar acquaintance with the life and social conditions of the people as would the parish area. In the case of a district, there were lighting, drainage, and public health questions to be considered. The reason why the district was given charge of the public health was that experience showed that in the smaller areas complaints were made against interested parties on the management by the sanitary inspectors; and it was felt that there should be independent control. Those were matters of mere pecuniary consideration, but when dealing with education they were not dealing with finance alone. There was parental control to be considered, and in the parish area they were in much closer touch with parental control and everything that concerned the welfare of the parish, as a parish.

The Secretary for Scotland's reason for a wider area was that he viewed the student passing through the elementary school to the secondary and on to the University, but everybody who knew Scotland knew that education was divided into three divisions. There was the parish school proper, which belonged to the old parish system, which was conducted by the parish school boards under State aid. The second division was the secondary school education, in which they had a new system altogether with a curriculum of its own worked out for years under a system of its own, and then there were the Universities. They were three entirely different divisions, and it did not follow that the men who were able to manage these different schools could manage the whole. The men who dealt with the Universities were quite distinct and different from those who dealt with the secondary and parish schools. Why did not they unify the whole system? They did not attempt to do that, and they must have a separate establishment to manage each scholastic body. It must also be remembered that the parish school was not an elementary school as understood in England. In every parish school in Scotland there had to be some secondary education at the top. That was so under the old parochial system, under which they were able to prepare pupils to go to the Universities. That was the ideal for which they ought to strive. They should recognise that every parish school taught some secondary education at the top. He did not say they should teach secondary subjects on secondary lines. When pupils went to a secondary school they went for a different class of training, but on the other hand, in the parish schools, the secondary education at the top was much better taught.

There was also the fact that the parish desired that the children of that parish should be taught in the parish school. If the children lived twenty miles away from the secondary school they would have to board near by, and when it came to boarding it mattered little whether the school was twenty, fifty, or one hundred miles away. The smattering of secondary education which a boy got in the parish school in any subject was a great benefit. It gave him a stimulus after he left the parish school to continue in that particular branch of instruction. The whole basis of this Bill was that the Government desired to put the secondary and elementary schools under one management, which was a great mistake. Education was stimulated as much by competition as anything else, and if they took the whole education, elementary and secondary, of a large district and took out of it all competition by having it managed by a body half-heartedly elected by six different parishes, the principle of secondary education would fall practically into the hands of teachers and officials, which was a thing to be avoided as much as possible. In Scotland they had 1,000 parishes, which meant 1,000 interests each striving against the other for the interest of its own particular area; each with a department of secondary education at the top of the parish school, the effect of which was that the secondary schools in Scotland were undersold by what was provided by the secondary department of the school board. That was the practice adopted by the Board of Education, and the Secretary for Scotland now wanted to reverse the policy and to keep down the elementary schools and raise up the secondary schools which the parish schools had been responsible for keeping down. The result of such a policy would be to drain the parish schools of their best pupils in order to put them into the secondary schools, and when the best boys of a school were withdrawn the tone of that school was spoiled. When they went to a school and found the head boys dons in the play-ground, it gave children even of three years of age a stimulus to go to that school and become dons at some future period. The result of it all would be a distinct cleavage and the parish school, which ought to be an efficient principle, would be lowered from what it had been.

Upon the question of areas, the parish area lent itself to the parish ideal. Secondary education lent itself to a larger area, but even secondary education could not be confined to mere territorial limits, men went from all parts of Scotland to the Universities. They could not maintain secondary education within the limits of one county. Let them take the county of Renfrew, which went up to the borders of Glasgow. People in Renfrew would not think of going for secondary education to Paisley or Greenock. There was a special reason for treating the education of Scotland as a whole. The Secretary for Scotland himself did not think there was to be any tax levied for secondary education in Scotland, and assuming that he got the funds the Bill asked for they would be provided out of the money provided for Scotland as a whole. The matter could not be worked territorially, either by the county or by the district, because secondary education did not lend itself to the same kind of arrangement as was best suited to the parochial schools. In the opinion of the Government the scheme of the Bill was undoubtedly vital, but he felt bound to enter his protest against the substitution of the district for the parish, being convinced that in the future working of the system many difficulties would occur and much heartburning be caused if the parishes were deprived of the control of their schools. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 16, to leave out all words from the word 'for' down to the word 'Aberdeen' in page 2, line 3, in order to insert the words 'every parish in Scotland' instead thereof."—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY said the Amendment was really an attempt to abolish the forward movement embodied in the Bill by keeping to the parochial unit for the education authority. He did not think that many words were necessary in support of the principle of the Bill. There was an almost universal consensus of opinion in Scotland that the time had come when, while fully admitting the usefulness of the parochial arrangement in the past, it was necessary in the higher conception of education which now prevailed to take a larger district than the parish area. That was absolutely necessary in the interests of secondary education. Once that was admitted, and admitting also the general proposition on which the Bill was based—namely, that it was desirable to have one authority for all classes of education, the case was at once proved against the Amendment. The hon. Member had tried to show that the scheme of the Bill was against the interese of the teaching profession. In that matter the teaching profession might be trusted to look after their own interest, and so far as this part of the Bill was concerned there were no more strenuous approvers of it than the recognised exponents of teaching, and he was content to believe that in this matter the members of the teaching profession were better judges than the hon. Member of their own interests. It was unnecessary to recapitulate the arguments which he used on the Second Reading of the Bill; he believed he was backed by the almost unanimous approval of those who had the cause of education at heart; therefore he should oppose the Amendment.

Mr. AINSWORTH (Argyllshire) said that while the Committee were on the subject of the importance of the parish as the unit of education administration, he desired to refer to one point of which he believed it would be necessary for the Bill to take some notice—namely, parishes on the west coast of Scotland where an island constituted a parish, and where it would be almost an impossibility for representatives to attend meetings of the larger district either on the mainland or on another island. How education was to be continued in places of that kind without some system analogous to the present parish system he failed to see. As an instance, the Island of Tiree might be taken as an example. There was there a large population, and education was a matter of supreme importance to the inhabitants, but it would be an absolute impossibility for the representative of that island to attend, with anything like regularity, education meetings on the Island of Mull which would probably be the district of which it would form part. He hoped, therefore, that if the present parish system was to be departed from the right hon. Gentleman would be able to devise some system by which the cases to which he referred could be properly dealt with.

Mr. BUCHANAN said the Amendment before the Committee raised a question which went to the very root of the proposal of the Government—namely, whether they should adapt the development of secondary and technical education to the existing system of elementary education with the parish as the area—a system which had worked with conspicuous success—or sacrifice the interests of elementary education to the possible future advantages of secondary and technical education. The Secretary for Scotland had adopted the latter view, and had practically answered the contention of the hon. Member for Mid-Lanark by saying that if the Committee agreed with the doctrine of co-ordination there was no case for the Amendment. Much more proof was really wanted of the salutary and effective nature of this doctrine of co-ordination, and the Secretary for Scotland would have acted more wisely if he had looked at the practical advantages which Scotland had enjoyed for the last thirty years under the existing system rather than to the prospect of possible advantages under one authority, more distant and less popular, which would look after both elementary and secondary education. But one could not fail to recognise that since the introduction of the Bill those who had spoken out on the subject had, in the main, supported the principle of the larger area, and he admitted that it was out of the question to ask the Government to alter the Bill so substantially as to base it upon a different principle. Members were entitled, however, to take the present opportunity of entering a protest, or, at any rate, of expressing their regret that the system, under which the parochial authorities who for thirty years had not only efficiently discharged the great work of elementary education, but had also done everything within their power to advance the cause of higher education, was not to be maintained and have grafted upon it some new organisation for secondary education, but was to be supplanted by a new system which might be good enough for secondary education, but which would certainly be less efficient for elementary education.

Dr. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.) thought the case of the islands was very well met indeed. He noticed that the Island of Cumbrae with 187 children was to have a locally autonomous authority, and it was certainly not advisable to go lower down than that. As to the Amendment before the Committee, he should feel bound to vote against it. He admitted the great work done by the small boards and the necessity of keeping the people in touch with the schools, but the scheme of the hon. Member was educational Home Rule run mad. In the county of Aberdeen there were ninety-two school boards; Forfar had sixty, and Lanark fifty, while in Peebles there was a school board for a village of which the total population was ninety-eight, of whom probably fifteen or twenty would be children. Why in such a case as that there should be an autonomous body, with a triennial election, involving various expenses, amounting probably to a 5d. rate, he could not understand. Much of the money raised for education had been spent in the unnecessary multiplication of purely official machinery. The scheme of the Bill was a very fair one, though he agreed that Sutherland would probably require some division, and that in other cases amalgamation rather than division would be required, and he would oppose the Amendment.

MR. CALDWELL said that the Secretary for Scotland had quietly stated that, inasmuch as the Bill went on the principle of co-ordination while the Amendment was inconsistent with that principle, therefore nothing more need be said against the Amendment. A more ridiculous assertion was never made. For the right hon. Gentleman calmly to assume that there could be any real co-ordination between secondary education and the parish school instruction was altogether absurd. The proposal of the Bill really meant that the whole education of Scotland was to be regulated in the interests of about 20,000 children.

SIR J. FERGUSSON (Manchester, N.E.) stated that the County Council of Ayrshire was unanimous in thinking it desirable that the whole county should be managed by one authority, and there was an Amendment on the Paper to give effect to that view. He thought the Committee should know that the ideas of the hon. Member for Mid-Lanark were not widely accepted in Scotland.

MR. THOMAS SHAW, while welcoming the assistance of the hon. Member for North Camberwell, reminded him that there were larger islands than the Island of Cumbrae. For instance, there was the Island of Lewis, and what would the hon. Member say if 404,000 acres with a widely scattered population were placed under one board. It was to meet such cases as that that the present Amendment had been moved. The cast-iron method of districts was just as bad as the cast-iron method of parochial areas. In his opinion what ought to have been done was to have kept the parochial divisions, and to have made provision for linking them up into districts having regard to the convenience of railway and sea communication and to the provision of secondary and technical education at certain centres in the district. On the merits of the Amendment itself, however, he was bound to accept the Bill in favour of districts, on the assumption that some provision would be made for sub-dividing districts in the case of huge extent of territory or large masses of population.

MR. H. C. RICHARDS (Finsbury, E.) said it was now found that the hon. Member for North Camberwell, who strongly opposed co-ordination in London, held different views where Scotland was concerned. The remarks of the hon. Member for Argyllshire had made it clear that it would be a rank injustice to compel representatives from the Western Islands to go to the mainland to carry out their educational duties, and therefore, if a division were taken, he should support the Amendment.

MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY said the hon. Member for Finsbury was leaving the port of London, which he knew, for districts with which he was not familiar, and he would remind him that the Island of Mull was not on the mainland.

Question put, and agreed to.

MR. CROMBIE (Kincardineshire), who had placed on the Paper the following Amendment—

"In Clause 3, page 1, line 17, after the word 'each,' to insert the words 'district, or where a district is deemed by the Secretary for Scotland too large or too small for the purposes of this Act, each part of a district, or group' "—

said that as the Secretary for Scotland had put down an Amendment which practically covered the same ground, he would simply state the scope of his own proposal. The principle with which the Government had started was that there should be one area and one authority for both primary and secondary education. That might be a good or a bad principle, but, as the Government had adopted it, the parish at once disappeared as being too small an area for secondary education. The Government were therefore limited to either the district or the county as the area, and in deciding upon the district he thought they had shown a certain consideration for the susceptibilities of those who wished to see not too large an area. The district, however, was open to criticism. Some districts, no doubt, should be sub-divided, but on the other hand there were many districts which would be too small, and he desired to express the hope that the right hon. Gentleman would adhere to his own Amendment rather than accept the views which were put forward by some of his supporters. If they adopted the county as the education area they would require a scheme with elasticity of some sort. He thought it would be better to adopt the smaller area and work up afterwards, rather than adopt the larger one and work downwards. He approved the Amendment of which the Secretary for Scotland had given notice, and as it would be more convenient to take the discussion on it he would not move his own Amendment.

*Mr. MACONOCHIE (Aberdeenshire, E.) moved an Amendment on Clause 3 providing that the county should be the administrative area for education purposes. He said he had been careful to get all the information he could on this subject from his constituents, and he had gone thoroughly into the matter. If the county area were adopted, the work could be delegated to parishes in such a way as to admit of the development of education on the lines carried on hitherto. It was contended by some that in the cases of Ross-shire and Inverness-shire this proposal would not be of advantage. Speaking from experience of these counties he considered that if they adopted the county area the sparsely populated districts would get the benefit of being in the larger rateable area. In the Islands of Barra and South Uist the whole of the school board rate was paid by the proprietors and a few large farmers, and the amount collected would not in his opinion be sufficient to give to the inhabitants there the necessary provision for technical and secondary instruction which the Scotch Members desired to give them. So far as Ross-shire was concerned, it was contended that Stornoway, or the Island of Lewis, with a population of 25,000, should be dealt with as a separate school board area.

Mr. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): The population is 30,000.

*Mr. MACONOCHIE said that might be so. If they had the advantage of the assessable area of the whole county they might be able without any expense to themselves to have a secondary school in the Island of Lewis, whereas if they made the island a school board area it was so poor that they would not be able to have that advantage He believed the valuation of the island had gone down 50 per cent. in the last twenty-five years. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 17, to leave out the words 'districts of.'"—(*Mr. Maconochie.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

*Sir CHARLES RENSHAW (Renfrewshire, W.) said there had been some discussion on the question of the desirability of maintaining the old parochial system of instruction in Scotland. Really and truly the question involved in this clause was not the question of parishes. It was the question whether or not districts of counties, or counties themselves, were to be the units in which in future education in Scotland was to be administered. There were three questions to be considered under this Amendment. In the first place there was the proposal of the Bill which was the hard and fast line of the local government district as the area for education purposes. On the Second Reading of the Bill he stated what in his opinion was the objection to that proposal. The second proposal was that now before the Committee, namely, that they should take the county as the education area of the new school board, and that, as was proposed in a subsequent Amendment standing in the name of the hon. Member for Dumfriesshire, the Secretary for Scotland, if school boards wished it, should have power to divide counties into special education areas. The third proposal was that they should take the district as in the Bill and give certain powers to the Secretary for Scotland to combine or divide districts. He thought all who had considered this from the point of view of the counties were grateful to the Secretary for Scotland for having placed on the Paper the Amendment standing in his name. He did not agree with the criticism of his hon. friend the Member for the Border Burghs as to the unkindness on the part of the Government in putting their Amendments on the Paper. He had often heard objections from the Opposition that Amendments were sprung upon them at the last moment without notice. They were under a great debt of gratitude to the Government for letting the House know beforehand what Amendments they would propose on the Bill. He hoped that what the Government had done in this matter would materially contribute to the rapid progress of the Bill in Committee. His right hon. friend had given notice of a proposal to take the district as the area and to give power to county councils, town councils, or school boards to apply to him that the whole county might for education purposes be made one area. He himself would prefer very much to take from the start the larger area. He believed it would be better from the educational point of view. The county areas had practically been for some time the working units, so far as secondary and technical education was concerned, under the limited powers devolved upon them in connection with technical education, which had been in operation for twelve or fourteen years. For that reason if for no other it would be desirable to continue the county as the unit. If they once gave up the parochial principle they would have to establish some other system of management. His hon. friend the Member for the Border Burghs did not like the system proposed by the Amendment in the name of the Secretary for Scotland so much as the proposal in the Bill. For his own part he infinitely preferred the Amendment to the proposal in the Bill. By setting up school boards for the larger areas he was convinced that they would get a better class of educationalists to serve upon them. In the Education Bill for England the county was established as the education area.

MR. BRYCE: A very bad thing this.

*__SIR CHARLES RENSHAW__ said he did not think his right hon. friend quarrelled with the largeness of the area. The English counties were infinitely larger than the Scotch counties, and if the Government were able to entrust to the county councils of England reponsibility for elementary, technical, and higher edution surely they could do so with still greater confidence to the counties of Scotland. He submitted that from another point of view it was very desirable that the county should be the area. Under the old system there were 940 different school boards in Scotland. Under the proposal in the Bill there would be 111 established. If they adopted the county area for the thirty-three counties, and if they sub-divided a few of them for special reasons, there would probably not be more than fifty or sixty school boards in the whole of Scotland. There would, therefore, be a great economy in the administrative work in Scotland.

There was another feature of the Bill which he should like to call attention to. Curiously enough the large and populous counties of Lanark and Renfrew suffered under the Bill from areas proposed to be established. He could not understand what objection there could be to the larger area of the county being adopted for the school boards in the county when they were going to establish so large an area as that proposed by the Bill for Glasgow. They were going to sweep in Govan which did not want to go. Pollokshaws was being taken out of his own county—he was afraid not unwillingly on the part of Pollokshaws itself which was the centre for a certain amount of education work and swept into the enormous district established for Glasgow. Leith was to be sacrificed to Edinburgh. He would not say that from an educational point of view that might not be an advantage; but if these large areas were to be established in the case of Edinburgh and Leith, and in the case of Glasgow—the latter including Govan, Rutherglen, and other places embracing more than 1,000,000 of population in its area—he could not understand why there was any hesitation whatever in taking the county as the area outside the enumerated areas. If the county were adopted as the limit it could in special cases be cut down into special educational districts, and they would be able, he believed, to get the best educational results. Therefore he would support the Amendment of the hon. Member.

*MR. BIGNOLD (Wick Burghs) said he understood that under the provisions of this Bill there would be a pooling of the 1890 and 1892 grants, amounting to £500,000 a year. Some of this money fell to the share of the Orkney Islands. The Amendment which the Secretary for Scotland had now laid upon the Table would be welcomed in Orkney because it supplied a power of combination of local government districts which was much needed there: without it the children of the northern islands who would have to come over to the mainland division for secondary and technical education would be shut out. He trusted that the Government would grant an allowance of a *viaticum* to enable the children to travel to Kirkwall. He thought that the Amendment practically embodied the desires of the inhabitants of the islands.

MR. HALDANE (Haddingtonshire) said that this was a new matter altogether, and had been approached without consideration of the existing circumstances in Scotland. There might be much to be said for the proposal of the hon. Gentleman opposite who contended that it was inconsistent to adopt one principle for England and another for Scotland. But in Scotland there was a set of circumstances with which the Government had to deal which was very different from that in England. In England the school boards only covered less than half the whole area, the rest being devoted to voluntary schools with educational appliances which were not of a satisfactory character. There was no organisation of educational opinion in England such as in Scotland, and accordingly, rightly or wrongly, the Government took the county as the educational area. But in Scotland the position was quite different. The whole country was covered with school board , and right through Scotland there was a highly organised educational opinion. It was, therefore, impossible for the Government to leave out of sight that local opinion on educational subjects demanded much closer attention than in England. The Government had taken the course which might not be altogether logical. and had adopted local government districts of the county which were not fashioned primarily for educational purposes; but one could not help feeling that in so doing the Government paid attention to the feeling of Scotland as a whole. He knew that there were some people in Scotland who felt strongly in favour of the county area; but he knew parts of the country where it would be impossible. He himself lived in the county of Perth—an enormous county—and the result of taking the county council as the governing body would be that the administration of all education would tend to fall into the hands of the lairds. What was wanted was that the local education mind should be represented, and that the men who were keen on education should have a chance of getting on to the school boards. He knew that in Lanarkshire, where education was highly organised, the condition of the whole educational work under the county council was beyond praise, and the county area might be started there without much difficulty. But take other counties, such as Fife. He had been told that it would be simply impossible to hope that the best educationalists could give up a whole day and take a long journey to attend meetings of the education committee. Though criticism might be offered on the logic of the Government proposal, he thought it was best.

*COLONEL DENNY (Kilmarnock Burghs) said that the hon. Gentleman had perhaps overlooked the fact that there were other Amendments on the Paper—one by himself—that the Secretary for Scotland should have power by order, if he considered it in the public interest, to divide a county into educational districts; so that even if this Amendment were passed, it would not necessarily mean that the county authority should invariably be the county school board. In the one case the county was divided by order and in the other the districts were aggregated. On the whole he thought the former was the better.

DR MACNAMARA said that the hon. Member for Renfrewshire used an argument from the English Education Act that the county area should be set up as the education authority. His experience of the working of the English Education Act was that nothing could be worse for the administration of education than the county area. Take the case of Devonshire; it was administered from the centre of Exeter, and the experience was that the conduct of education was falling into the hands of the leisured class and of the paid officials. Some day or other some Government would have to decentralise these huge areas. It was impossible that the administration of the education of the country should be carried on permanently by a bureaucracy. He was as much against microscopic administrative bodies as against large ones. In half a dozen of the counties of Scotland it would be physically impossible for the school boards to be representative of the people. Inverness-shire had an area of 4,200 square miles, Argyllshire 3,200 square miles, and Ross and Cromarty 3,000 square miles. How was it possible to administer primary education in such large areas as these with efficiency? The experience of the Education Act of 1902 was all against the county area. Then there was the question of the payment of the travelling expenses of members of the school committees. The Government refused it in England and he supposed they would refuse it for Scotland, though the Scotch people got many concessions which the English people did not. He hoped the Secretary for Scotland would not listen to the Amendment.

MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY said he quite recognised that this was a question of expediency. He would be perfectly frank as to why he thought it necessary to resist the Amendment, with the view of asking the Committee to accept an Amendment he had on the Paper. That Amendment was put down because he thought the feeling of the House was, without doubt, that there ought to be a measure of elasticity; and if there was to be elasticity at which end were they to begin? He quite admitted that throughout the length and breadth of Scotland the history of education and of the school boards which they were displacing showed that there were many more counties which needed division than should remain undivided. That being the case it was surely very much better for everybody, and certainly for himself, that they should begin with a state of affairs which prevailed in the major part of the counties, and leave it to the action of the Department to be guided by public opinion in aggregating the districts where necessary. In other words, he would have a great deal more to do in the province of dividing than he would have in the province of aggregating; and he thought it would be to the advantage of everyone that he should be called in as little as possible. For these reasons, and looking to the necessities of the Highland counties, he hoped the Committee would reject the Amendment.

MR. WEIR said he was glad to hear that the right hon. Gentleman was going to oppose the Amendment. The information of the hon. Gentleman who proposed the Amendment was most inaccurate. He said that the population of the Island of Lewis was 25,000 when it was 30,000; and that the valuation of the island was going down. If that was so, it was because the deer forests had been undervalued. He had just received a telegram from the town clerk of Stornoway asking him to oppose the county as the education area. That proposal was so monstrous that he was amazed it had ever been suggested. He, himself, had made up his mind long before he had received the telegram to oppose the Amendment.

MR. BRYCE said he thought the Committee would recognise that this was a real difficulty; and that it was exactly the same difficulty they met with in connection with the English Education Bill. The difficulty was that they wanted a different area for elementary education and for secondary education. For elementary education they wanted a comparatively small area; and secondary education a comparatively large area. The best area for elementary education would be either the parish, or a combination of parishes, and the best area for secondary education would be the county, or possibly in the case of a large county like Lanarkshire a division of the county. The principle on which the Government proceeded was that there must only be one authority. That was an inevitable difficulty, and all the Committee could do would be to endeavour to choose the least of the evils. It would be a great evil to sacrifice elementary education to secondary education; yet practically that was what they were asked to do. It was admitted that it was desirable that members of the working classes and the peasantry should take part in the work of elementary education; but that could not be if the county were to be the area even with the payment of travelling expenses. That put the county out of Court as the authority for elementary education. On the other hand, it was clear that most of the districts would be too small to make proper provision for secondary education. Secondary education could not be organised with a smaller population than 40,000 or 50,000. As the hon. Member for North Camberwell said, it was perfectly true that in England the elementary system was not working. He knew a county in the South of England which, finding that it was unable to deal with elementary education, delegated the work to district committees. That was what they asked for in 1902, but which they did not get. The experience of England showed that the county was not the proper authority to deal with elementary education. The real remedy for the difficulty was to allow elementary education areas to combine for the purpose of secondary education, and statutory power should be given for the purpose. That was not in any way inconsistent with the plan of the Secretary for Scotland. If the right hon. Gentleman saw any objection to that, at any rate he could hardly object to a clause enabling the elementary education authorities to appoint delegates to undertake secondary education in their respective areas. He would, however, prefer the plan of the Secretary for Scotland to that of the Amendment, as it would enable them to overcome the difficulty with which they were confronted without sacrificing elementary education, and at the same time give secondary education its proper chance.

Mr. MAXWELL (Dumfries-shire) said that the education authority might consist of the county councillors and the parish councillors for a particular district, who would supervise all education, secondary and elementary, in that district. The Bill, however, did not proceed on those lines. In a great many cases it had been found that district committees were far too small; and even if power were given to them to combine for the purpose of secondary education, there would be great difficulty in carrying out their duties. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Aberdeen said that a population of 40,000 to 50,000 was necessary in order to carry out a proper system of secondary education; but in sixteen of the counties in Scotland the population was under 50,000, and half of those counties were to be divided up into district committees. The proposal he had on the Paper was that, in the first instance, there should be one school board in the county; and that it should have power to apply to the Secretary for Scotland to be divided up into committees. In that way better districts would be formed than under the proposal of the Secretary for Scotland. However, as the right hon. Gentleman had met them so far, he would be prepared to accept his Amendment; although it did not go the whole length he desired.

Mr. WALLACE (Perth) said that the hon. Gentleman who moved the Amendment admitted that the county would not be a satisfactory area; and he suggested that power should be given to sub-divide it. On the other hand, everyone could see that there was no difference in the view expressed by the supporters of the Amendment, and by those who opposed it. They all admitted that power should be given to sub-divide, if the county were to be the area; and that if the district were to be the area, power should be given to unite several districts. Everyone agreed that the locality should be consulted, and that the view of Scotland should be respected; and, that being so, it seemed to him there was very little difference between the Amendment of the hon. Gentleman and the Amendment of the Secretary for Scotland. He himself preferred the Amendment of the Secretary for Scotland. It respected local opinion, and in that way they were likely to get a satisfactory area.

*MR. MACONOCHIE said that after the explanation of the Secretary for Scotland he believed that the question was only one of method. Whether they would take the county and work downwards, or take the district and work upward, they were all agreed on the principle. Probably the Amendment of the Secretary for Scotland would be the better plan. With reference to the remarks of the hon. Gentleman the Member for Ross, he would say that his experiences of the county extended over twenty-nine years, and that for fifteen years he lived in it for a certain period every year. He would ask leave to withdraw his Amendment.

MR. PARKER SMITH (Lanarkshire, Partick) said they were all agreed that there ought not to be a cast-iron rule for all the counties of Scotland. It had been said that there were only four counties that needed to be divided; but there was a considerable difference between the division of a county and what the Secretary for Scotland was asking for. If they were divided they would not divide into proper districts, and he hoped, therefore, that greater latitude would be taken by the Scottish Office in deciding how the districts were to be divided. They ought not to be the old local government districts—districts which were arranged for quite another purpose; they ought to be allowed to go across the boundary, where it was necessary to take n any part and incorporate it in the district.

MR. AINSWORTH suggested that if the Scottish Office took powers over and above those for the sub-division of the counties into districts to divide the districts into parishes, or a combination of parishes, it would meet the case of the Highland parishes to which he had referred previously. He hoped before they came to the final discussion on the Scottish Secretary's Amendment the right hon. Gentleman would see his way to carry out the suggestions made to him.

THE EARL OF DALKEITH (Roxburgh) said the local government districts with which he was acquainted were not well suited for educational districts. It was doubtful whether the Scottish Board of Education would have more work to do under one form than under another; but it would be much easier, he thought, if the county was first adopted as the area, and was then sub-divided into districts suitable for educational districts. There were many counties where the county was far more suitable for a district than were the Local Government Board districts. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman, in considering the matter later, would see his way to making that change.

MR. THOMAS SHAW expressed his concurrence with what had fallen from his noble friend in regard to the unsuitability of the Local Government Board districts, which often embraced three or four counties in which there was a perfect network of towns, and those districts would be most unsuitable for educational districts. But he also thought a county was an unsuitable area and that brought him back to his original idea that the proper solution was to take the towns as centres and to grade out from them. The Secretary for Scotland proposed to divide those counties which were not already districts into districts; but even there he was embarassed by the county divisions. Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman might see his way to give powers of combination, not only to districts in individual counties, so as to enable one county to link up with itself any inlying portion of another county. He made that observation in the hope that the power of combination would be so used as to bring closer together the educational needs of a particular district.

MR. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland) said the success of this Bill depended largely on the question of area. So far as his constituency was concerned, the districts there were absolutely impossible and unworkable under any such scheme as this. At the same time, a hard and fast line that the county should be the area would, in many cases, make things very much worse. He sincerely hoped that the elasticity alluded to by so many Members would be given, and that the Secretary for Scotland would take the necessary powers, if he found public opinion was ripe in certain directions, and that the people of a district having local knowledge were of the opinion that certain districts might be amalgamated. If the right hon. Gentleman would take power to give effect to the wishes of the people in that way, all the necessities of the case would be met.

Mr. CALDWELL said this Amendment showed the great difficulty experienced when they departed from the principle of the parish area. When they came to the district area they immediately found themselves awkwardly placed with regard to the rest of the county. When they came to deal with the county they were still more awkwardly situated, because of the other counties bordering on it; and the result was that from an educational point of view, there would never be a county or a district, but a combination based on educational grounds entirely. That showed the absurdity of starting to make a district when they had immediately to make great exceptions, instead of attaching it, as they would have to attach it, to the parish areas.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 23, at the end, to insert the words 'Provided that, before the commencement of this Act, on a representation received not later than the twenty-fifth day of October, one thousand nine hundred and four, from a county council or district committee of a county council, or from a town council, or from an existing school board, and from time to time after the commencement of this Act, on representation from a school board, the Secretary for Scotland may, by order or orders, which order or orders shall be laid as soon as may be upon the Table of both Houses of Parliament, determine that any two counties including as aforesaid, or that any two or more local government districts, including as aforesaid, in any county, shall, for the purposes of this Act, be combined into one district, or that any county not divided into local government districts, including as aforesaid, shall, for the purposes of this Act, be divided into districts, and such districts shall be specified in the order; and the foregoing provisions of this section shall not apply to any county or local government district, including as aforesaid, so far as comprised within a district or districts specified in any such order, but a school board shall be established for each of the districts so specified. In making an order after the commencement of this Act under this section the Secretary for Scotland shall follow as nearly as may be the procedure prescribed by the forty-sixth section of the Local Government (Scotland) Act, 1894, with respect to the making of an order for altering the boundaries of parishes, and shall have the necessary powers in that behalf, including power to provide for all matters which appear to him necessary or proper for giving full effect to the order, and where necessary for the adjustment and distribution of the powers, property, liabilities, debts, officers, and servants of the school boards affected by the order, and for the settlement of differences arising out of the order.' "—(*Mr. A. Graham Murray.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. PARKER SMITH said the Amendment would go a long way towards relaxing the rigidity of the provision, but he did not think it went far enough. The Secretary for Scotland would have power to deal with whole counties or whole local government districts; he would be able to put two complete counties, or two or more complete local districts together, but that was hardly sufficient. Under the scheme of the Bill the borough of Govan was included in the Glasgow district; but there was a small part of the parish of Govan outside the borough, and outside the boundaries of Glasgow, and outside the proposed new education area. This small part would be entirely isolated, and nothing was more obvious than that if the borough of Govan was to be taken in with the district of Glasgow the small part in the Lower Ward of Lanark should be taken in also. That was merely an illustration; dozens of similar cases would arise, and it might be desirable in some cases to divide even parishes. It was, therefore, very desirable that the Secretary for Scotland should have power to deal with parts of counties or parts of local government districts. In order to provide for that, he desired to move an Amendment providing that any two or more counties or parts of counties, or any two or more local government districts or parts of districts might be formed into one district, and he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would see his way to accept that proposal.

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"In line 8, after the word 'two' to insert the words 'or more.' "—(*Mr. Parker Smith.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY said that as the hon. Member was really raising a general question of the same class as that raised by the hon. Member for the Elgin Burghs, it would be as well to state what his attitude in the matter was. He would prefer to take his own Amendment as it stood; but as the view seemed to be prevalent in the Committee that more elasticity was required, he was prepared to accept words to give effect to that feeling, subject however, to one understanding. He could not accept the view that parts of parishes might be dealt with. That would never do, because though conceivably from an educational point of view cases of that kind might arise, any such action would throw the whole question of rating into confusion. They could not have absolute perfection in every case; more or less rough lines had to be taken; therefore, while he was willing to give further elasticity in the matter of sub-division of districts, it must be clearly understood that that sub-division should follow parish lines. The particular words of the Amendment moved by the hon. Member for the Partick Division were hardly necessary, as he could not conceive uniting more than two counties, nor would the words suggested by the hon. Member for the Elgin Burghs be quite satisfactory. If, however, the Committee would accept the Amendment as it stood on the Paper, he would undertake to consider the matter from the point of view of draftmanship, and bring up a proposal on the Report stage to carry out the views which had been expressed.

Mr. THOMAS SHAW said the Committee would doubtless accept the proposal of the right hon. Gentleman. Personally, he would suggest the insertion of the words "any two or more local government districts or parts of districts, included as aforesaid in any county, or in one or more counties." That would cover the case he had more than once referred to — of a district in one county which might very properly be annexed to a district in another county. On the question of rating, he entirely agreed with the right hon. Gentleman that nothing more confusing could be enacted than that different sections of the same parish should be assessable under different authorities.

Mr. PARKER SMITH said that if hon. Members had shared with him the ill-fortune of living at a point where four counties met, they would not regard the desirability of the collocation of more than two counties as inconceivable. With regard to parishes, the cases he had in mind were those in which the proposed educational boundary cut across the parish. The right hon. Gentleman would require powers to rectify such cases, otherwise a small portion of the parish would be left outside the area which it was proposed to constitute. If it was understood that the right hon. Gentleman would provide for such cases as that, the Committee would doubtless accept whatever form of words he brought forward on the Report stage.

Mr. CALDWELL suggested that in some cases it would be desirable to have a working agreement between different areas.

Mr. BRYCE said that as the Secretary for Scotland proposed to make considerable alterations in the clause, he desired to make a suggestion and to inquire whether the right hon. Gentleman would give effect to it. On the point already dealt with there was little difference of opinion in the Committee as to what was desired, and in all probability the words which the right hon. Gentleman would bring up would meet with general acceptance. He thought, however, that the real object of having a union of districts would be less frequently for the purpose of elementary education than for the purpose of secondary or technical education, and the question he desired to ask was whether the right hon. Gentleman would consider the desirability of taking powers to unite districts or counties for the purpose of secondary education where they were not united for the purposes of elementary education. He had intended to move the insertion after the words "purposes of this Act" of the words "or for such of those purposes as relate to technical or higher education," but as it might be better to deal with this power of union by a separate clause, he did not propose to move that Amendment at the present stage. He hoped, however, that the right hon. Gentleman would give him an assurance that the point would be considered.

Amendment to the proposed Amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. CALDWELL moved to insert after the word "Parliament" the words "but shall not come into force until after an Address in favour of the same shall have passed both Houses of Parliament." ["Oh, oh!"] He was surprised that an hon. Member should say "Oh, oh," to such a proposal, as everybody who knew anything about Parliamentary procedure was aware that it was no use to place Orders on the Table of the House when nothing could be done with them. According to the Rules of the House, if it were simply provided in an Act of Parliament that certain Orders should lie on the Table for a certain period, there was no opportunity on which those Orders could be discussed, or any opinion expressed in regard to them. This was a very important matter, as it dealt not only with the question of education but also with the question of taxation. One district might be seriously injured in the matter of rating by being linked with another, and while the district whose rates were reduced by such a union might view the matter with equanimity, that certainly would not be the case with the district whose rates were increased. Under the Amendment it would only be necessary for the county council, the town council, or an existing school board, to apply for a certain combination, and the Secretary for Scotland to sanction it. But the school board might have been elected without any reference to such a combination, and he submitted that it would be very unfair for the ratepayers to be involved in considerable expense without their previous knowledge or consent. If the scheme of the Bill was to be altered in the manner now proposed there ought to be some provision by which the matter could be debated in the House of Commons. Questions of little importance might very well be dealt with without discussion; but in a matter which involved questions both of education and taxation the ratepayers ought to be safeguarded. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"In line 8, after the word 'Parliament' to insert the words 'but shall not come into force until after an Address in favour of the same shall have passed both Houses of Parliament.'"—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY said the hon. Member had omitted to explain that the effect of the proposed Amendment would be to stultify entirely the concessions which he (the right hon. Gentleman) had just made to the general feeling of the Committee. The hon. Member desired that nothing should be approved until a favouring Address had passed both Houses of Parliament. The Act was to come into operation next year; the first representations had to be made by 25th October. Unless, therefore, an autumn session was to be held for the express purpose, it was not likely that the approving Address could be voted until some time in the following year; while if the hon. Member made as good use of his opportunities as he usually did, it was extremely doubtful whether the approving Address would pass at all. The only result, therefore, would be to take away from the counties concerned the very power of effecting combinations or sub-divisions for which the Committee had been contending.

*MR. TENNANT (Berwickshire) said that unless this Bill differed very much from other Acts of Parliament, there would always be an opportunity given to pray His Majesty to modify or to reject altogether the Orders referred to. Orders under the Factory Act were frequently discussed after twelve o'clock, and he presumed a similar course might be followed with regard to the Orders under this clause. Perhaps the Secretary for Scotland would kindly inform him if this was not so.

*MR. CATHCART WASON said a more utterly preposterous proposal than that made by the hon. Member for Mid-Lanark he had never heard. If the excessively selfish proposition of the hon. Member was agreed to, the whole of the educational advantages which Orkney and Shetland hoped to derive from this Bill would be rendered nugatory. He was really surprised to find the hon. Member posing as a crusted Tory, and refusing to place confidence in the people. These authorities were elected by a purely democratic vote; they were to be trusted in matters of this sort; and, as it was purely on their initiative that the Secretary for Scotland could act, he could only suppose that the Amendment was submitted for a purpose which he did not like to describe. The Amendment proposed by the hon. Member to the Amendment, which had already been accepted by the Government on clear proof that the Bill would be unworkable not only in Orkney and Shetland but in other counties, would undo all the efforts he and others had been making and without which their education districts would be in dire confusion. The view of the hon. Member might be met by leaving out all reference whatever to Parliament, as there was absolutely no necessity to lay the Orders on the Table. It was a matter purely between the Secretary for Scotland and the local authorities who had the interests of the children of the district at heart. The right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland desired to carry out the wishes of the people of Scotland, so far as he possibly could, without any undue interference by Parliament. There was too much interference by Parliament in many affairs already.

MR. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs) said he did not think the castigation by the hon. Member for Orkney and Shetland was at all called for. The hon. Gentleman came here with the enthusiasm of a recent convert and lectured the hon. Member for Mid-Lanark as to what was the meaning of the Amendment before the Committee. The hon. Member had not apprehended the Amendment. He desired to disassociate himself from the hon. Member when he said that Parliament interfered too much in these matters. Apparently his idea was that everything should be left to the Secretary for Scotland and the local authorities. They had all much confidence in the present Secretary for Scotland, but he would not always occupy that office; and the point they had to consider was whether they were to welcome with open arms the Amendment proposed by the right hon. Gentleman, which was intended to meet many of the Amendments on the Paper. As he understood the Amendment it really shelved a question which this House ought to consider and decide. The right hon. Gentleman said, "Place confidence in me, and hand the whole thing over to me, and then I will make an Order on some future occasion which will be carried through." That brought them to the question how far they should hand over authority to the Secretary for Scotland. The Amendment of the hon. Member for Mid-Lanark simply said that the House should retain some powers in order to enable them to disagree with any Order made by the Secretary for Scotland. The question was whether they were to have an effective power of objecting to the action of the Secretary for Scotland. The present system of laying such Orders on the Table of the House was no check at all if they desired to interfere with the action of the Secretary for Scotland. The Bill proposed that Leith should be included in Edinburgh; but at some future day it would be open to the Secretary for Scotland, on the application of one of the parties interested, to oppose the wishes of this House in that matter. They ought to retain effective power in such matters of criticising any action of the Secretary for Scotland with which they might disagree. He had, therefore, great pleasure in supporting the Amendment of his hon. friend.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON said the Secretary for Scotland had told them what the effect of the Amendment would be, but not what would be the effect of his own proposal. That proposal was to lay these schemes on the Table of the House. What power would the House have over them? None. Therefore, the words in the Bill had no practical effect at all; and the point on which the decision of the Committee would turn was whether they desired to have an opportunity of discussing these Orders or not. The presence of these words gave the public the impression that the House had control over these Orders, and, unless the phrase was struck out, he thought the clause should be amended in the sense proposed by the hon. Member for Mid-Lanark.

Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY said there was really, so far as he knew, no misconception about this matter. The words in the Amendment were that the Order or Orders "shall be laid, as soon as may be, upon the Table of both Houses of Parliament," but that did not give the right of stopping the procedure embodied in an Order. They must get the Education Bill started somehow. They must get it started with certain districts with school boards, and the proposition of the Government was that the local government district should be the district to elect the school board. The Committee had almost unanimously said that that should be the district, but there were certain cases where there ought to be combination, and in order to give certain elasticity he had brought forward this clause, not of his own motion, but in order to meet the views which had been placed before him. If the words proposed by the hon. Member for Mid-Lanark were put in, it would simply mean that the Secretary for Scotland would be unable to exercise the power of combination until they could have a discussion in some future session of Parliament for which the Government would necessarily have to find time. So far as the actual power of Parliament was concerned, he would remind the Committee that they would always have the power to discuss the whole question on the Estimates when the vote for the salary of the unfortunate Secretary for Scotland was brought forward. If the Secretary for Scotland were so left to himself as to take such an extraordinary course as that suggested by the hon. Member for the Kirkcaldy Burghs in regard to the disjunction of Leith from Edinburgh, the hon. Member would have his chance of defeating the Government. The words about laying the Orders on the Table of both Houses of Parliament were introduced because that had been the long established practice, but nobody supposed that it gave Parliament an opportunity for stopping what was proposed. He agreed

that for all practical purposes the words might as well be out, but he did not see any necessity for taking them out, because if he were to do so it would take this matter away from the practice which had been followed in such matters.

Dr. MACNAMARA said he wished to get an opportunity of discussing the circumstances if he thought the Government were going wrong. If the scheme was made by the Education Department the right hon. Gentleman was to make it after the representations of the locality. What he wanted was that the right hon. Gentleman should make the scheme according to the representations of the locality. The English Act said that if a scheme had not been made by the local authorities with the approval of the Board of Education within twelve months, that Board might, subject to the provisions of the Act, make a Provisional Order which could be discussed in Parliament. Would the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland say that in the future administration of this Act, if he drew up a scheme on the representations of the localities, that scheme would be cast in the form of a Provisional Order which could be discussed in Parliament?

Mr. CROMBIE said that his hon. friend had raised an important principle. It seemed to him that there was every necessity for the House discussing minutes and circulars issued by the Education Department. It was very obvious that if this Act was going to come into operation on the day appointed, it would be perfectly impossible to discuss all these points. It must be remembered that the localities in question would have, by the Amendment before the Committee, an opportunity of putting their views before the Education Department.

Mr. CALDWELL said that the object of the right hon. Gentleman's Amendment was to make a change in the educational districts different from that which might be in the Bill. That was a most important change, for the Secretary for Scotland might make an Order for a combination which, if it had been made in the House, the House would not have sanctioned. The proposal was to delegate powers to the right hon. Gentleman to do something which might be repugnant to the House. It was said that this was a case of urgency; but this he denied. Time was to be taken to consider the changes after hearing all parties. But the Amendment of the Secretary for Scotland did not limit itself to changes that might be made on the 25th October, but applied to every subsequent change. These changes would have to be carefully considered, and there was no reason whatever why Parliament should not have an opportunity of expressing an opinion upon them. The change would not be merely a question affecting education, but a question affecting rates as well. He did not want to limit the power of the localities or of the Secretary for Scotland, but to see that the Order, or Orders, making the change were laid before Parliament, so that the House might have an opportunity of discussing them. He had no antagonism to a change; but if a change was needed, it ought to be made with deliberation, and nothing should be done to prejudice the rights of Parliament.

SIR MARK STEWART (Kirkcudbrightshire) said he hoped the Committee would come to a decision at once. They were making very small progress, all because one or two Members were setting themselves up against, practically, the unanimous wishes of the Committee.

MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY said he had considered the suggestion made by the right hon. Member for South Aberdeen, but this was not the place in the Bill to carry it out. They must settle the education body at once. He thought that the education body should have power to administer both primary and secondary education, but he could quite see that there might be cases where there should be combination for secondary education and not for primary. It was very much better that that should be dependent on the local bodies themselves than on the Secretary for Scotland. He would be glad to give favourable consideration to a clause put down on page 55 by the hon. Member for Kincardineshire, which provided that—

> "It shall be lawful for the school boards of two or more adjoining education districts, whether in the same county or not, to appoint a joint committee which shall formulate and, if approved by the several school boards concerned, administer a scheme of education common to such districts."

It was quite clear that that clause, with a very little alteration, might be made to serve the purpose of the right hon. Member for South Aberdeen.

MR. BRYCE said he quite agreed that the Amendment of his hon. friend offered a basis for a scheme of the kind he had suggested.

MR. THOMAS SHAW said he thought it was very unfortunate that his hon. friend had moved his Amendment in a positive form. It would have been far better if he had moved it in a negative form. He would suggest that the Amendment should read—

> "Which Order or Orders shall be laid, as soon as may be, upon the Table of both Houses of Parliament and shall come into effect, unless disapproved of, within forty days."

The reason why he was anxious about this point was that within his own Parliamentary recollection they used to have, after twelve o'clock, the privilege of discussing Amendments on these Orders; and he remembered on one occasion when that had been done with very great advantage to the country. That privilege had disappeared owing to an alteration of the Standing Orders, but he would like to see it restored. This was the first occasion on which they had had the opportunity of securing any power of review of the large powers assumed and exercised by the Scotch Education Department, and he thought this was an excellent opportunity for having the fiats of the Department laid on the Table of Parliament and discussed.

MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY said that the proposal of the Amendment did not seem practical. What would happen? Representations would be made to him next October. According to the hon. Gentleman, Parliament was to have the power of disallowing these Orders within forty days of their being laid on the Table of this House. Parliament would meet about the usual time, that was to say, about the 15th of February next, and the forty days would not elapse until after the first school board election. They would not know where they were. Like Mahomet's coffin, they would be hanging in mid-air.

Mr. DALZIEL said he did not consider the right hon Member's arguments conclusive. All they desired to do was to make their protest more effective to the House. The fact that the right hon. Gentleman had drawn his Bill in such a way as to make it impossible——

Mr A. GRAHAM MURRAY said he did not draw this clause, all he had to do was to introduce the Bill. The whole thing arose because this clause, which had the assent of nearly every one in the House, did not suit the views of the hon. Member for Mid-Lanark and the hon. Member opposite.

Mr. DALZIEL said they would see how many differed when they took the division.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs) said the point made by his hon. and learned friend near him was that if these words meant nothing at all they should not have been put into the Bill. Though the right hon. Gentleman did not draw this clause, it was his clause still. He knew who put these words in, and that the person who put them in must have had some intention in doing so. It was a most objectionable thing to put in words that seemed to involve the connivance of Parliament when, as a matter of fact, Parliament had no power in the matter.

Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY said they were always very pleased when the right hon. Gentleman took part in the debates of the Committee, but he wished the right hon. Gentleman could have been in the House a little earlier. Three-quarters of an hour previously he had expressed his willingness to take the words out. He might point out that it had always been the practice in all Education Acts since the Act of 1872 to lay all administrative Acts of the Department before Parliament.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN asked whether in the case of the Code there were not special provisions that when these things were laid on the Table of the House they must be dealt with in a particular manner.

Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY admitted that that was the view of Mr. Speaker Peel; but Mr. Speaker had ruled differently, and it was not so now.

Mr. THOMAS SHAW said he agreed with the right hon. Gentleman in that statement; it was because he wished the House to regain that which it had lost that he had spoken.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 82; Noes, 199. (Division List No. 146.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herb. Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Austin, Sir John
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Bowles, T.Gibson(King's Lynn
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burt. Thomas
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Cremer, William Randal
Crooks, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)

Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobbie, Joseph
Edwards, Frank
Fenwick, Charles
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herb. John
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hammond, John
Hayden, John Patrick
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Hobhouse, C.E.H. (Bristol, E.)
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk.
Joicey, Sir James
Kilbride, Denis
Labouchere, Henry
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.

Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Long, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Mooney, John J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Rt.Hn.John (Montrose
Murnaghan, George
Newnes, Sir George
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow,W.
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Pirie, Duncan V.

Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Reid, Sir R.Threshie (Dumfries
Richards, Henry Charles
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt.Hn.C.R(Northants
Sullivan, Donal
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Caldwell and Mr. Dalziel.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt.Hn.Hugh O.
Asher, Alexander
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt.Hn. Sir H.
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A.J.(Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W. (Leeds
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boulnois, Edmund
Bowles, Lt.-Col.H.F(Middlesex
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt.Hn.J.A.(Glasgow
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain,Rt.Hn.J.A(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Crombie, John William
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cullinan, J.
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Delany, William
Denny, Colonel
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dickson, Charles Scott
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Dorington, Rt.Hn. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Dunn, Sir William
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Elibank, Master of
Ellice,Capt E.C(SAndrw'sBghs
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fergusson, Rt.Hn.SirJ.(Manc'r
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gore,Hn G.R.C.Ormsby-(Salop
Gretton, John
Gunter, Sir Robert
Hain, Edward
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harris, F. Leverton(Tynem'th)
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, James (Staffords. N.W.)
Henderson, Sir A.(Stafford,W.)
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Joyce, Michael
Kennaway, Rt.Hn.Sir John H.
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W.(Salop.
Kerr, John
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Sir Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Jos. (Monmouth)
Lawson, J. Grant (Yorks., N.R.
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hon. W. (Bristol, S.)
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J.(Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver,Sir Lewis(Edinburgh,W
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell, W.J.H. (Dumfriessh.
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Middlemore, Jn. Throgmorton
Milner, Rt.Hn.Sir Frederick G.
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hn. J. Scott (Hants.)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murphy, John
Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute)
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nolan, Col. J. P. (Galway, N.)
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid.)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Partington, Oswald
Pease, Herb. Pike (Darlington)
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Power, Patrick Joseph
Pretyman, Ernest George
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Rankin, Sir James
Reddy, M.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roche, John
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Rt.Hn.J.G(Oxf'dUniv.
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tuff, Charles

Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Ure, Alexander
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Wason, Jn. Cathcart (Orkney)
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. (Taunton
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

MR. GEORGE BROWN (Edinburgh Central) said that the last Amendment which was accepted by the Secretary for Scotland dealt with divisions of counties. There was, however, another class of combination which ought to be kept in mind; and that was the combination of a rural district with an adjacent suburban district. The fact that such cases might arise was shown by the number of Amendments which appeared on the Paper on the subject. The acceptance of his Amendment, however, might have the effect of a number of those Amendments being withdrawn. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"In line 10, after the word 'county' to insert the words 'or any local government district or any enumerated district.'"—(*Mr. George Brown.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY thought the Committee would agree that in this matter they had gone far enough. It was really inadvisable that these questions should go back to the Government Department more than was absolutely necessary. The enumerated districts were really the large cities in Scotland, and it would be very inexpedient from time to time to disturb the existing areas by taking in portions of the county districts. He therefore could not accept the Amendment.

Question put, and negatived.

MR. AINSWORTH said it was necessary in the interest of the Western Islands that the Secretary for Scotland should have the power to constitute separate parishes or combinations of parishes as areas under the Act.

MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY (intervening) stated that he had already agreed to bring forward words on the Report stage dealing with that point.

MR. AINSWORTH said that in that case he was perfectly satisfied.

Proposed words inserted in the clause.

MR. PARKER SMITH said the Amendment he was about to move, although it raised a local question, affected more than one-fifth of the whole population of Scotland. It involved educational issues raising questions of principle as well as of local feeling. The object of the Amendment was to continue to Govan its local independence. The parish of Govan immediately adjoined Glasgow. There was no obvious physical distinction between the two. Govan contained the Burghs of Partick and Govan itself, as well as other large districts, and was partly inside and partly outside the municipal area of Glasgow. The population was 200,000, and was rapidly increasing; the assessable rental was over £1,000,000; and there were more than 30,000 scholars. There was scarcely any difference between Glasgow and Govan in the matter of rating, and, as it stood the parish school board of Govan was the third largest in Scotland. The school board and town councils of Govan and Partick strongly desired that things should remain as at present, but the school board and the Corporation of Glasgow wished Govan to be included in their area. Although feeling had been manifested before on this subject, there had been no previous attempt to give effect to it, and no ground was alleged even now by the school board and the municipality for the inclusion of Govan. No suggestion whatever was made against the efficiency of the school board for Govan, and the presumption under these circumstances seemed to be in favour of the continuance of the present position. The issue presented by the Amendment was between continuing the school board as it at present existed and amalgamating it with that of Glasgow. No one, either inside or outside Glasgow, would be satisfied with a scheme under which one-half of Govan was included in Glasgow and the other half left outside. If anything at all was done, the parish must be dealt with as a whole. In asking that the parish should be left in its present position, he was not asking anything inconsistent with the scheme of the Bill. The proposals of the Government laid down no hard and fast rule as to boundaries, whether municipal or otherwise, and the whole action of the Committee during the afternoon had been to place more and more discretion in the hands of the Secretary for Scotland in the matter of dividing areas in the manner best suited for educational purposes. That being so, it was necessary to consider this problem only on educational grounds, and he hoped the Secretary for Scotland would allow the Committee to express its view on the matter freely and that he would not enforce the views of the Government by the appointment of the official Whips in the division.

The arguments for and against the proposal were partly educational and partly otherwise. By some it was held that the proposal would influence municipal divisions in the future. The town councils of Partick and Govan had hitherto strongly objected to being included in Glasgow. They maintained a position of friendly and neighbourly independence, but they held that their position in the future with regard to municipal annexation would be seriously affected if they were included in Glasgow for educational purposes. Parliament had uniformly declined to force annexation upon any local body which did not desire it, and that in itself was a strong argument against this annexation for educational purposes being forced upon Govan. The arguments in favour of the proposal on educational grounds were much stronger. Hitherto Glasgow and Govan had existed side by side without the slightest friction. Children had been interchanged between one board and the other with perfect freedom. Govan had a full and complete equipment for education of all descriptions, and it possessed half-a-dozen higher-grade schools in which pupils could be, and were, carried on until they were ready to go to the University. What gain, then, would there be in throwing the two areas into one? There were great advantages in having districts of a reasonable and moderate size, inasmuch as it allowed members of the board to have a personal knowledge of the affairs of the schools and teachers, which was quite impossible in an enormously large area such as Glasgow. Everybody was in favour of large areas, but the question was—how large? He submitted that it was better to have an area with 250,000 inhabitants than an area with 1,000,000 inhabitants, but under the scheme of the Bill Glasgow would contain a population of fully 1,000,000, and have under its charge 150,000 children and over 4,000 teachers. It was impossible for the members of one board to have personal touch with so large an army of children and teachers, and there would be considerable danger of the work being done simply through officials. There were advantages to be set against this in having one large area, but they had not made themselves felt in the past and they had not been expressed by the town council or the school board of Glasgow. The amalgamation was not desired by the parish of Govan, and the Government could not point to any educational reasons for the change. In all the schools up to the higher-grade schools the apparatus of Govan was perfectly sufficient for all that was to be done in the parish. The teachers would prefer that there should be a continuation of the present system, because they were more in touch with a smaller board than they would be with a larger one. He thought a place like Govan was entitled to continue with that separate control which had hitherto been exerted with such admirable results.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 3, after the word 'Glasgow' to insert the word 'Govan.'"—(*Mr. Parker Smith.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'Govan' be there inserted."

Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY said this was a question which had to be determined on educational considerations alone. One of the great objects of the reorganisation of the system of secondary education was to prevent expensive and harmful overlapping. There was no place where overlapping was more apt to occur than in the great towns where there was more than one education authority. He would remind those Members of the Committee who were not familiar with the geography of that part of the world that the city of Glasgow was composed partly of the city parish, partly of the Barony parish, and partly of Govan parish. Everbody probably remembered the long municipal controversy which culminated in the city of Glasgow as it now existed. It included in its borders among other places Partick which was originally a separate police burgh. It should, therefore, be clearly understood that it would not suit the proposer of this Amendment to take the burgh of Govan as it existed separately from Glasgow.

MR. PARKER SMITH: It is now.

MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY said the point which he really was leading up to was that it would not be in accordance with the wishes of the proposer of this Amendment if the town of Govan were allowed to be a separate education authority. What they wished was that the whole parish of Govan as it now existed should be a separate education authority. In other words they would take out of the city of Glasgow that portion of the city which lay within the parish of Govan.

MR. PARKER SMITH: For education purposes.

MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY said he meant that. That would be a situation perfectly unique. The great idea in framing the Bill had been to take the cities as they found them and not to take anything away from them, but here it was proposed to carve out of Glasgow a certain portion in order to erect it into an educational centre which they would call Govan. The offices of the Govan School Board were at the present moment in Glasgow, and no wonder, because Govan was a parish which lay on both sides of the Clyde. To carve out Govan from Glasgow and make it an education area by itself, irrespective of boundaries, would really encourage competition and overlapping, and he did not think he would be consulting the best educational interests if he accepted the Amendment. He hoped his hon. friend would be far from thinking that he was dogmatising as an educational expert in this matter. He had done his best to ascertain what was the best educational opinion on the subject and it was all one way. The school board and the town council of Glasgow were in favour of the provision in the Bill.

MR. CALDWELL said he knew the districts intimately. The Secretary for Scotland had quite properly stated that the effect of making Govan an educational authority by itself would be to take a small portion out of Glasgow. But the fact that there happened to be a small portion of Govan in Glasgow was surely no reason for swallowing up the larger portion, and that was practically the proposal of the Bill. What they had to consider was how the matter stood at present. Govan parish had certainly a large population by itself, and it had an educational system of its own. It was all very well to say that it was necessary to avoid overlapping, but while the Secretary for Scotland expressed that pious opinion he gave the Committee no indication that there was overlapping. In point of fact, those who knew the district were well aware there was positively no overlapping whatever as between Govan and Glasgow. The schools were full, and the parents in the district had their choice of sending their children to the one or the other, according to convenience. He was sure the Secretary for Scotland would not contend that the Govan School Board had not been well managed. It was one of the best school boards in the kingdom—in some respects better than that in Glasgow—because it was less unwieldy, and more immediately under control. There were in Govan special industries, distinct from those in Glasgow, and the schools were adapted to serve the wants of the district in that respect. It would be a great mistake to absorb the school board management of Govan in that of Glasgow, because the work could not be undertaken without delegation of powers to people who were not direct representatives of the ratepayers of Govan. Govan had shown that it was not wanting in enterprise. It had a valuation equal to that of Glasgow, and its rate was something less. He thought that it would be beneficial to have competition between the schools of Govan and Glasgow, instead of combining them in one large area.

MR. ALEXANDER CROSS (Glasgow, Camlachie) said he supported the clause as it stood. This was a great measure of consolidation. The Committee would observe that the clause provided for the consolidation of the school board districts of Glasgow, Govan, Partick, Kinning Park and Pollokshaws. The matter was not so simple as the hon. Member for Partick had stated. The parish of Govan absorbed a large portion of the very best part of the rating area of Glasgow, such as Hillhead and Kelvinside. The interests of Govan could not be separated from those of Glasgow.

MR. DALZIEL said that if the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland had shown that any overlapping had existed in the past, or was likely to exist in the future, in regard to educational matters, provided the Amendment was accepted, the right hon. Gentleman might have had a good case. But the argument, so far as it had proceeded, was all on one side. They had in Govan one of the most popular and successful of the Scottish school boards. It had done more work than the Glasgow School Board, and the whole question was whether the opinion of Govan was practically unanimous in favour of a continued separate educational existence.

And it being half-past Seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

EDUCATION BOARD PROVISIONAL ORDERS (CARDIFF AND NEWPORT (MONMOUTHSHIRE) BILL (BY ORDER).

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.) said his object in putting down the Motion which stood upon the Paper was to call attention to the difficulties under which a number of his co-religionists, in Newport especially, many of them the children of parents of his own race, laboured under this Provisional Order Bill.

*MR. SPEAKER: Do I understand the hon. Member's object in moving the rejection of the Bill is the same as that which he has for moving the Instruction.

MR. BOLAND said he desired to defeat the Second Reading of the Bill, but that if he failed in that then he desired to move the Instruction.

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is in order; but I was going to suggest that if the object was exactly the same the hon. Member should allow the Second Reading to go, and devote his attention to the Instruction.

MR. BOLAND said he thanked Mr. Speaker for his suggestion, but he preferred to address himself to the rejection of the Bill. Under this Provisional Order no provision had been made for a Catholic representation on the Education Committee of Newport, yet out of a total of 14,000 children in all the schools of Newport 2,000 were Catholics, while in the voluntary schools there were 2,000 Catholic children out of 2,500. In other words the Catholic children of Newport were one-seventh of the child population of that district, and were four-fifths of the child population of the voluntary schools. A stronger case for a Catholic representative on the Education Committee could not exist. How was the Education Committee under this Provisional Order to be constituted? According to the Bill there was no provision whatever for a Catholic representative, and the only means by which the Catholics could have representation on the Education Committee was to be found on page 40 of the Bill, where it provided that a member might be put forward by the voluntary school managers. There was such a member now on the Newport Town Council, but he was a representative of the Church of England schools which had amalgamated for this purpose. What he was concerned with was not so much to lay emphasis on the constitution under the Provisional Order but to avoid the danger in the future that Catholic representatives should be excluded. His great object also was to avoid the religious question being raised in municipal elections. It would be a most unfortunate thing if in municipal elections the religious question were brought up and it was said that such a candidate should be put forward or opposed because there was or was not a representative of his religious opinions on the Education Committee. It was in order to avoid religious strife of this kind that he suggested now that until in this Provisional Order it was arranged that a Catholic should be on the Education Committee, this Bill should not be proceeded with.

With regard to the interpretation of the Education Act, he called attention to some of the difficulties in which a member of an Education Committee would find himself. It was perfectly clear from the Act that provision should be made in all cases where a claim for representation could be legitimately made out. The value of the discussion which he now raised was the fact that it gave to Parliament the opportunity to say what it really meant when it passed the Education Act by construing the words of the Act which it had passed. In Newport there had been a desire to avoid friction if possible. On the part of the Catholics there was a desire to meet all sides fairly; they recognised that on the county council they had good representation, but they recognised the fact that although that representation was good there was no guarantee that that state of things would continue, and the Catholics would not be mindful of the welfare of their children unless they saw a provision made in the Provisional Order that that representation should continue. In conclusion he urged upon the House that this was a most exceptional case, that the proportion of the Catholic children in Newport was out of all proportion to what obtained in other parts of the country and that the Catholics of Newport felt as they had an exceptional case that before this Bill went through the co-option clause should be made to include Catholic members conversant with the educational needs of the county, and that these matters should not be, as now, left more or less to chance. He moved that this Bill be read a second time this day six months.

Mr. POWER (Waterford, E.) said he formally seconded the Motion, and could add very little to the speech made by his hon. friend, which proved the truth of the contentions made on several occasions. They could not say what the actual result of the Act of last year would be, time alone would tell, but it was only natural that Catholics should make a fight for their schools.

Amendment proposed—

> "To leave out the word 'now' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day six months.'"—(*Mr. Boland.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

*Sir FRANCIS POWELL (Wigan) said his hon. friend ought to be congratulated on the great skill he had shown in dealing with circumstances diverse in their character and often extremely difficult. It was of happy augury that after the somewhat angry discussions which had taken place in 1902 there should remain only one case in which the decision of Parliament was sought. All other discussions had ended amicably and he hoped this would also. All the other cases had been concluded by an amicable conference between the hon. Baronet and the local authority concerned, and this was the only case in which that more friendly solution had not been taken advantage of. The onus of proof in this case rested very much with those who desired to refuse the Second Reading of this Bill. It was impossible that the conditions of Newport could be so different from those of other places that there must be a different mode of settling a difficulty to that which had been arranged in other places. Newport was a prosperous mining and commercial town with every appearance of happiness and success. The provisionthat all members of the Education Committee should be members of the town council had been adopted in no case whatever. There had been, he believed, in every case a power of election either by the council itself or by those whose recommendations had been submitted to the council and approved by them. That was strongly recommended by the right hon. Member for Aberdeen on behalf of the Commission over which he had so well presided. He had argued most forcibly, and to his (Sir Francis') mind conclusively, as to the importance of not confining the members of the Education Committees to the members of the councils alone, but of taking advice outside. By seeking such advice they got greater uniformity in the sanitary laws. It was a very great misfortune that towns near to one another should live under different Sanitary Acts, and he hoped the time would come when Parliament itself would reverse its steps and would make for that uniformity which hitherto it had discouraged. He thought the same law ought to prevail with regard to matters of education. The instances in which appointments, nominations, or recommendations were made from outside were almost innumerable, and showed that the suggestions of the right hon. Member for Aberdeen, which had been practically carried out in the operation of this Act, had been acceptable to the great communities. In the case of Leeds, they had on their Education Committee a representative of the Yorkshire College, Wolverhampton had one from the Birmingham University, Wakefield co-opted from the Yorkshire College, Cheshire from the Liverpool University, Lancaster from the Manchester University, Suffolk from the Cambridge University, Warwick from the Birmingham University, Liverpool from the Liverpool University, Manchester from the Manchester University, Rotherham from the University College, Sheffield. He himself had the honour of being a member of the Education Committee of Wigan, and there they had a representative of the University of Liverpool, who was one of the most valuable members on the Committee, bringing as he did from that University information which they did not possess at Wigan, and which was of the greatest benefit to them.

The clause to which objection had been taken provided first of all that the members of the Education Committee should be members of the county council and then proceeded to say, "if at any time in the opinion of the council a sufficient number of persons qualified as required by this Order cannot be found among the members of the council they can ask for the addition of three members chosen from outside its own members." There had been cases of this kind in various parts of Yorkshire which were sufficient to prove the value of that principle in working the Act, and its popularity. He hoped the House would come to a unanimous conclusion in this case and that there would thus be an end of all these cases without any adverse voting. That would be a happy omen of the time when there would be more unanimity in the case of education which would promote the progress of that great movement of which they all desired to see the success.

DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.) said the discussion was valuable because it gave the Board of Education an opportunity of stating exactly their interpretation of the Act of 1902. Section 17, as originally drafted, made it obligatory for outsiders to be on an Education Committee, but it was altered in its passage through the House. The view taken by the Board of Education was that it was obligatory, and the Board of Education continued in that spirit for a long time. They badgered Bridgwater for a very long time. Bridgwater contended that the words "where it appear desirable" governed not merely nomination or recommendation but also the broad fact that where it was not desirable, outsiders need not be put on. The Board of Education said that was not so, and badgered them until they put on an outsider. The same thing happened to the little town of Loughborough, who took the view that they need not have outsiders on their Education Committee unless they liked. The Board of Education would not have that at any price, and the Parliamentary Secretary the hon. Baronet insisted in the most emphatic way that he would in all schemes submitted to him compel the community to have outsiders on the Committee. The thing went on; Cardiff and Newport remained recalcitrant—they said we will have members of our town council on our Committee, and we will have a woman on our Committee; that is obligatory, but we will not have outsiders unless we think it is desirable. Then came the London County Council with a scheme in which they said they would have only London County Councillors on the Committee, and then the Board of Education caved in and did not dare to badger them. It got out of the difficulty in the most puerile way. It said, "Tell us, if you please, whether there are in the Council persons versed in educational interests." He thought that the Board of Education were interpreting Clause 17 entirely at variance with what had been consistently stated from the Treasury Bench. His own position was perfectly clear. He resisted co-option when the Bill was being passed; but now the Board of Education ran one way in London and another way in the smaller towns. He objected to co-option because he desired that the education authority should be directly elected. As far as he was concerned, he should like to see Catholics on the Education Committee, but they ought to stand first as members for the town council. He rested on a democratic basis in this matter. The whole incident, apart from the vagaries of the Education Department, showed the utter folly of his Catholic friends in rejecting the *ad hoc* principle. What had been the experience since 1870? There was a Roman Catholic representative on every great school board; but under the new Act it was complained that Catholics could not get representation. He read a speech the other day which was delivered by the Very Rev. Canon Richardson, of Manchester, who said—

> "When the Act of 1902 was first introduced he thought it was a measure which would do a lot of good. It had, however, turned out to be a rotten Act which was doing Catholics a lot of harm."

If the Newport School Board was left as it was, it would certainly have a Catholic representative, just as Catholics had been represented on the school boards of London, Liverpool, Manchester, and other cities. It was too late for his Catholic friends to ask for preferential treatment; and it would have been better had they voted for a directly elected education authority.

COLONEL NOLAN (Galway, N.) said that the hon. Gentleman the Member for North Camberwell was always asking them to trust everybody at the polls, but what if they could not obtain a representative by direct election? The Education Act was a very good Act for Catholics. It give them a great deal of money, although they did not get as much as was given to the Board schools, and he thought that Catholics should struggle to have representation on the various education authorities. He suggested that the hon. Gentleman who moved the Amendment should let the Second Reading pass without a division, provided he got the Instruction. Catholics could not claim to have a majority of the representation; but they certainly ought to be represented by at least one member. Surely, the House would not be afraid of allowing one Catholic member on the board of management; and he hoped that the Government would be able to accept the Instruction.

*THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir WILLIAM ANSON, Oxford University) said the fact that the Provisional Order had been attacked on two sides, one complaining that co-option had been suggested, the other that co-option had been insufficiently secured, showed that the Board of Education had been fair and impartial in the matter. The Board had never varied in its policy. It had never raised any objection to the Committee being entirely constituted of members of the council, always provided they were assured they were persons of experience in education and acquainted with the educational needs of the area, and they had asked every local authority, which did not place outsiders on its Committee, not to close the door to co-option in case persons duly qualified should not be present on the Council.

There was not a local authority averse to co-option which had not accepted, after more or less hesitation, such a scheme as was now before the House. [Dr. MACNAMARA: What about the case of London?] Among the local authorities which had accepted such a scheme were the county of Monmouth, the boroughs of Bradford, Halifax, and Scarborough, while a good many local authorities in Wales had accepted schemes in which not less than a certain number of the Committee must be, and and all might be, members of this Council. In regard to London he could not help thinking that, when Parliament had laid upon the County Council the enormous burden of educational administration, the Board were right in allowing the County Council to work out its scheme of education in its own way—[Dr. MACNAMARA: In accordance with Section 17]—in accordance with Section 17. But had this scheme borne hardly upon any local authority? Of the three boroughs for which schemes were being made by Provisional Order Swansea had not opposed, Newport was now prepared to accept such a scheme, Cardiff desired no more than to enter a protest against any suggestion of co-option. He did not think the Board of Education did any injustice to any local authority in asking them not to close the door against co-option if at some time they should find they could not obtain suitable members in the council for their Education Committee. As to the Amendment of the hon. Member for South Kerry, the Board of Education had never been unmindful of the anxiety felt by the managers of denominational schools that they should have representation on the Education Committees, and they had always pointed out to the local authorities that the anxiety of those bodies would be allayed if they were given a spokesman—for it came to no more—on the Education Committee. But if the local authorities replied that they objected on democratic principles to co-option, or that they were afraid that if denominational representation was introduced into the Education Committee it would give rise to religious disputes and difficulties; and when they further said that they had no intention of dealing unfairly with denominational schools, but desired that the Education Committee should consist of members of their own council, the Board had always given way to the local authorities. If the Board refused to give way to the local authorities in such a matter, it was not one Provisional Order but fifty or sixty Provisional Orders they would have to introduce, and the time of the House of Commons would be occupied in discussing the details of education schemes over a great part of England. Moreover, it would be no benefit to the schools whose representatives were forced on the Education Committee by the Board of Education in opposition to local feeling. As matters stood, he knew of no complaint of injustice having been done to Roman Catholic schools in districts where the Roman Catholics had no direct representation on the Education Committee. In Bradford and in Newcastle-on-Tyne there were in each case more than 4,000 Roman Catholic children in the schools, in St. Helen's more than 5,000. There was no special provision for Roman Catholic representation and there had been no complaints. What was asked for in the case of Newport was preferential treatment of one denomination and a complicated procedure for choosing a Roman Catholic for this Committee which would be embodied in a Provisional Order and only alterable by Bill. He was sure that the Board were right in the interests of the smooth working of the Act, and of the schools themselves, to decline to force on local authorities a form of representation to which they were averse.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs) said that, personally, he was not opposed to the co-option of outside members to Education Committees. On the contrary, he would welcome it; but what he objected to was the forcing of local education authorities to elect outside members when such a proceeding was contrary to local opinion. The Secretary to the Board of Education admitted that; and that was practically his own opinion also. If he was a member of the Newport Town Council, he would favour the inclusion of persons of experience; but he objected to forcing on the elected authorities the nominee of outside bodies against their wish.

Sir WILLIAM ANSON said that under the Provisional Order the Education Committee would have power to co-opt persons of experience if they so desired, and only if they so desired.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said the point he wished to put was that the principle of co-option ought not to be forced upon reluctant authorities. If a town council preferred to trust its own members who were elected by the people, why should not they be allowed to do so. He thought that towns like Newport and Cardiff would elect the very best men available. After all, the duties cast on the local authorities by the Education Act were more important than the duties cast upon them by any other Act; and, therefore, he objected to their being forced to co-opt against their will. He thought the Act was perfectly clear upon that point. It was intended that the power of co-option should be left to the local authorities to exercise if they considered it desirable. After all, a town council was the best judge as to the wants and needs of its locality. The local authorities were afraid that the academic element might become too strong. There was considerable suspicion of that element; and in some places there was as much prejudice against it as there was against parsons. The local authorities were afraid of persons of that kind being forced upon them. The Secretary to the Board of Education drew distinctions between London and Cardiff, and he said that London was treated differently from Cardiff. But why was that? It was because when the Act for London was passed they had had a year's experience of the Act of 1902; and they found that there was in the country a feeling of resentment against the action of the Board of Education. If there was a distinction to be drawn between London and Cardiff it was not altogether in favour of London. In London less than 40 per cent. of the electors recorded their votes, but that was not the case in Cardiff. If a distinction was to be drawn he would rather trust those who had given the most genuine guarantees of their interests in education. He thought these public bodies could be trusted to select the best people to look after their own interests. The Board of Education had been very careful to carry out Sub-section 3 of Section 17, which referred to nomination by voluntary schools and outside bodies, but he noticed that Sub-section D was ignored altogether. He had never before seen a Provisional Order of this character. He did not think his hon. friend need fear that the Catholics in Wales would be unfairly treated provided they showed that they had some confidence in the people. He was perfectly certain that the Catholics had never had any reason in the past to consider that they had been treated unfairly by the vast bulk of the people of Wales. Unfortunately, the Catholics had ranged themselves on the side of those whom the Opposition considered were the enemies of Welsh education at the present moment. They had gone inside Port Arthur and consequently they must take the risk; but if a shell struck a Catholic school it was not because they were aimed at the Catholics, but because they were aimed at the battlements. They were not trying to hit anybody in particular, but they were firing into the line of battle. Therefore the Catholics must not take it that those who opposed this measure had any angry feeling towards them, because there was really no feeling at all in the matter. As his hon. friend had told the House there were Catholics upon the Cardiff Town Council, and there was no objection towards them simply because they were Catholics. There were also, he was informed, Catholics on the Newport Town Council. He wished to say, however, that if Catholic representatives were to be forced on the people by a Provisional Order he was afraid it would do the Catholics themselves more harm than if they trusted to the good sense of the people in Wales. The hon. Baronet the Member for Wigan said he was in favour of this proposal because it created uniformity, but it was perfectly clear that the hon. Baronet could not have studied these schemes, for he had never seen a measure in which there was less uniformity. Because this measure interfered with the local autonomy of two towns which were well fitted to manage these things for themselves he should oppose this Provisional Order.

MR. GRIFFITH BOSCAWEN (Kent, Tunbridge) said he had never heard a more extraordinary speech than the one which had just been delivered. The hon. Member for Carnarvon said he was supporting the rejection of this Bill in order to secure a particular kind of co-option, although in the past he had objected to any form whatever of co-option.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said that on the contrary he had supported co-option in the case of his own council.

MR. GRIFFITH BOSCAWEN said the hon. Member for Kerry had moved the rejection of this Bill in order to secure a most objectionable kind of preferential co-option in the case of the Cardiff education scheme. The co-option he desired was a co-option for a particular religious denomination, and this House, he was sure, would never agree to give preferential treatment to any religious denomination, however strong they might happen to be. That was the position he had always taken up. The hon. Member opposite not only did not want this co-option, but he did not want even the possibility of a future council exercising the right of co-option, and yet he asked the House to reject the Bill. Coming to the special objections which had been raised to this Provisional Order, he did not think that those hon. Members who had raised objections understood the proposals of this measure in the least. It had been said that they ought not to compel the town council or county council to co-opt, but the real fact of the matter was that this scheme did not give any such compulsion whatever. It simply laid down that the Education Committee was to consist of twenty-six members of the town council of Cardiff and two women, provided that if, in the opinion of the council, a sufficient number of competent persons could not be found amongst the members of the council, the council could co-opt three members from outside. So far from compelling co-option this Bill permitted it at a future time if the council thought it desirable. A future Cardiff Town Council might come to the decision that they could strengthen their Education Committee by co-option, and why should they not have that power? The hon. Member for Carnarvon talked a great deal about democratic institutions, but now he appeared to be afraid of the working of them, and he wanted to tie the hands of future town councils of Cardiff by the narrow opinions held by the present town council. For his own part, if he had any objection to this Bill at all, it would be not because it compelled co-option but because the compulsory powers were so very weak. He would sooner see co-option in all cases so arranged that all educational interests and all the different religious denominations should be adequately represented. His only objection was that this measure did not go far enough, and if the hon. Member for Kerry had moved his Amendment in the interests of all denominations he should have supported him. He could not see how anybody who desired to see these great authorities carrying out education in their areas in the interests of all concerned, and in the most enlightened spirit, could object to the council having this very mild power of strengthening their hands by additions from outside if they thought it desirable.

LORD EDMUND TALBOT (Sussex, Chichester) said he agreed that in this matter of representation Catholics had a distinct grievance. Although he sympathised with the hon. Member for Kerry he did not advise him to press his Amendment to a division, because if a division were taken and his proposal were carried, it would defeat the very object which the hon. Member and himself had in view. Therefore he hoped the hon. Member would take the advice of the hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for Galway and not carry his proposal to a division. If he did press it to a division he was afraid he should have to vote against him.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS (Glamorganshire, Mid.) said it was a new thing for the hon. Member for Tunbridge to ask that there should be no preferential treatment for any religious denomination. He had followed this controversy very closely, and he was bound to say that in his opinion he did not think there was any compulsion in this scheme, but it was a mere conformity with the letter of the law. So far from being of a compulsory character, the proviso stated that the town council need not co-opt, and it limited the power of co-option which they at present possessed. If in the opinion of the council a sufficient number of persons could not be found among the members of the council, then the council might enlarge the Committee. Therefore the scheme said the town council were not to co-opt at all unless the council concluded that it did not contain a sufficient number amongst its members qualified to act. They were only to co-opt if, in the opinion of the council for the time being, there was not a sufficient number of members qualified to act upon the Education Committee. He should like to see the county borough of Cardiff or Newport represented by a council who were prepared to say that their council did not contain a sufficient number of people qualified to constitute this Committee. Why was this scheme brought forward as a Provisional Order? Why, merely to let down gently the Education Department, who had to confess themselves beaten in their struggle with the Welsh boroughs, but were allowed to pretend to force these schemes upon them. They were told when the Education Bill was under consideration that if they got into struggles of this kind the Government would find themselves worsted, but nevertheless they were wasting the time of the House of Commons in passing a Bill to confirm Provisional Orders in order to do that which could have been accomplished by sanctioning a scheme were it not that the Education Department wished to save its *amour propre*. He was sorry that the hon. Member for Carnarvon had stated that he was going to vote against these Orders, because he was in favour of them. In Wales, up to the present, in the administration of secondary education they had kept outside these denominational difficulties. With regard to the Catholics he thought that far and away the wiser course for the Catholics to pursue was to trust to the Education Committees appointed by the various education authorities. At the present moment it was well to remember the part which the Catholics took along with the supporters of the Government in the slaughter of school boards. As they all knew, on the school boards in the past the Roman Catholics had always been able to get a representative by means of the cumulative vote, and, therefore, having assisted to abolish school boards he did not think it became them now to complain that they could not get everything in the scheme which was embodied in the Act of 1902. He should vote for the Second Reading of this measure, because he thought this Provisional Order was absolutely harmless and it would allow the Education Department to drop down gently.

SIR JOSEPH LAWRENCE (Monmouth Boroughs) said that as Newport was the principal town in his constituency, he hoped the House would let the Bill go to a Second Reading. He sympathised with the object of the hon. Member for South Kerry and the other Members of the Irish Party in insisting upon some representation being accorded under the scheme to the Roman Catholics of Newport. But it was evident from the course the debate had taken that any attempt to secure preferential treatment for any particular denomination was bound to be defeated, and under these circumstances it was better to accept the inevitable with a good grace, and trust to the correct feeling and sense of fair play of the majority of the local education authority to act generously to the minority. The hon. Member for South Kerry had made his protest, and that was all that could reasonably be expected now, for since the four Catholic Members of the Newport Town Council, whom they might have looked to to protect the interests of their own body, had consented to the scheme, the ground for any opposition in the special interests of the Catholic body was cut from underneath the feet of himself and the hon. Member opposite. He appealed therefore to the Irish Members to withdraw the Amendment and Instruction, and so not to interfere with the favourable reception which was now given to the scheme by the Catholic town councillors of Newport; and he urged this also in the interests of educational harmony. On the merits of the Instruction itself he should like to say this—that perhaps there was no other town in Great Britain where a stronger case could be made out, or where facts more eloquently spoke in favour of some exceptional educational representation being accorded to the Catholic body, than Newport. Four-fifths of the children in the voluntary schools were members of that faith, and if the House only knew of the denial and self-sacrificing labours which the Roman Catholic clergy and laity of the town had practised in order to provide for the educational wants of their poorer brethren, the knowledge of those efforts would only extort the warmest approval.

Mr. BOLAND said that with the permission of the House he would withdraw his Motion.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. Lowther (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 3.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 3, after the word 'Glasgow' to insert the word 'Govan.'" (*Mr. Parker Smith.*)

Question again proposed, "That the word 'Govan' be there inserted."

Mr. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs) said it seemed to him that the case for excluding Govan had not been made out, for there had been no proof of the suggestion that there would be any overlapping between Govan and Glasgow. Govan had one of the best conducted school boards in Scotland, and he did not think any reason had been brought forward for incorporating it with Glasgow. He was aware that there was a great deal to be said for the larger educational area, but for the reasons he put forward before the adjournment, he had very great pleasure in supporting the Amendment.

Mr. PARKER SMITH (Lanarkshire, Partick) said that the accusation that Govan wanted to cut into Glasgow was like the old fable of the wolf and the lamb, because, on the contrary, it was Glasgow that wanted to cut into Govan. The parish of Govan had been an educational unit outside Glasgow for a very long time, and it comprised not only the borough of Govan, but also Partick and other places. Educational districts were going to be drawn separate and distinct from municipal or any other districts, and because the parish of Govan was within Glasgow for municipal purposes was no reason why it should be included for educational purposes. Naturally the municipality and the school board of Glasgow were anxious to have as large an area as possible within their jurisdiction, and no one could blame them for desiring anything of that kind. Glasgow Corporation and the school board desired to have Govan included in their area, but they had not alleged any adequate reasons for taking this course. The hon. Member opposite had said that there might be overlapping, but no case had been made out showing that any overlapping had taken place in the past. There were schools of all kinds quite equal to meeting the needs of the locality in Govan. What was at the bottom of the desire of Glasgow to include Govan was that they wished to make this an argument for further municipal extension. Municipal extension had been governed in the past by the wishes of the parties concerned, both inside and outside the area, but if a compulsory extension was made in regard to education over the district outside, which was now fully capable of supplying the best education, and against which no case had been made out to show that it was inefficient or wasteful, a new precedent would be introduced which he was sure would be very mischievous in the future. He hoped that on this question the House would be left free. This was not a matter of interfering with the principles of the Bill, but a case where they had a district of nearly 250,000 people who desired to continue independently because they believed it would be more advantageous to allow the district to remain as it was at present, and because it was not of too large a size to admit of that personal knowledge of schools and teachers which in education was a matter of very great importance. Therefore he hoped the House would be willing to allow

Govan to continue to have an independent existence.

Mr. CORBETT (Glasgow, Tradeston) said that the real reason why Govan wanted to retain her present position was that she happened to have nearly all the wealthiest suburbs of Glasgow within her rating area. Not only on the north side of the river but on the south side the wealthiest suburbs were situated, and to allow such a district to remain outside the Glasgow area was a thing which could not be defended. Not only had Govan no separate existence and no natural boundary apart from Glasgow, but if they examined the boundary line they would find that Govan ran like wedges into Glasgow, and there was not a straight cut between the two. In everything that the Glasgow School Board did for the benefit of the community, Govan obtained its share, but they contended that if they had a line zigzagging between the two communities the difficulties would become enormous. He assured the House that a very different opinion was held by the school board of Glasgow, and if there was a case for Govan being kept separate, there was an equally strong case for cutting off a large slice from the areas of any of their great cities.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 52; Noes, 189. (Division List No. 147.)

AYES.

Ainsworth, John Stirling
Asher, Alexander
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herb. Henry
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Crombie, John William
Dalziel, James Henry
Dobbie, Joseph
Elibank, Master of
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Fenwick Charles
Fuller, J. M. F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Horniman, Frederick John
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Jones, D Brynmor (Swansea)
Kennaway, Rt.Hn.Sir John H.
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Maxwell, W.J.H. (Dumfriessh)
Partington, Oswald
Pirie, Duncan V.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Russell, T. W.
Schwann, Charles E.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Spencer, Rt.Hn.C.R(Northants
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas,David Alfred(Merthyr)
Ure, Alexander
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, Jn. Cathcart (Orkney)
Weir, James Galloway
White Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Parker Smith and Colonel Denny.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arnold-Forster,Rt.Hn.Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Austin, Sir John
Bain, Col. James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A.J.(Manch'r
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W. (Leeds
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Black, Alexander William
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boland, John
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bowles, Lt.-Col.H.F (Middxs
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt.Hn.J.A (Glasgow
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Chapman, Edward
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cullinan, J.
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Dunn, Sir William
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt.Hn.Sir William Hart
Ellice,Capt.E.C.(SAndrw'sBghs
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fergusson,Rt.Hn.Sir J.(Manc'r
Finch, Rt Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, P. S. (Warwick, S.W.)
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gore,Hn G.R.C.Ormsby-(Salop

Gore, Hon. S.F.Ormsby-(Linc.)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Henry D.(Shrewsbury)
Gretton, John
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hain, Edward
Hammond, John
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Hayden, John Patrick
Heath, Arthur Howard(Hanley
Heath,James (Staffords., N.W.
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford, W
Hope, J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Joyce, Michael
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W.(Salop.
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Kilbride, Denis
Knowles, Sir Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.
Lawrence, Sir Jos. (Monmouth
Lawson,J.Grant (Yorks., N.R.
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hon. W. (Bristol, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J.(Portsmouth
Lundon, W.
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
MacVeagh Jeremiah
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Crae, George
M'Iver,Sir Lewis(Edinburgh,W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Malcolm, Ian
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Milner, Rt.Hn.Sir Frederick G.
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Mount, William Arthur
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute)
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nicholson, William Graham
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid.)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Malley, William
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Pease, Herb. Pike (Darlington)
Percy, Earl
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Power, Patrick Joseph
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Pym, C. Guy
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy David
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stock, James Henry
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Sullivan, Donal
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt.Hn.J.G(Oxf'dUniv.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Wallace, Robert
Walrond, Rt.Hn.Sir WilliamH.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col.A.C.E(Taunton
Welby, Sir Chas. G. E.(Notts.)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wodehouse, Rt.Hn. E.R.(Bath
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland - Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

*COLONEL DENNY said he rose for the purpose of moving his Amendment excluding Leith from the suggested area. At the present time there was no overlapping, and the boundaries did not impinge upon the boundaries of the city of Edinburgh, consequently there was no danger in placing Leith upon its own feet. Leith was educationally complete, for they had a complete system of elementary and secondary education, and they also possessed a technical college. They had in Leith a most excellent school board, and, what was more important, it cost £1 per child less in Leith for education than in Edinburgh. Leith had more children for the size of the population than any other community in Scotland, and therefore any burgh of that character was perfectly competent to stand upon its own legs. Leith provided education for all classes in its own area, while Edinburgh had done very little comparatively for secondary and technical education. Some of the endowed schools in Edinburgh were not open to children who did not happen to be the children of the citizens of Edinburgh. Edinburgh educated only from 50 to 60 per cent. of her children under the school board system, whilst the proportion educated under the school board system in Leith was between 80 and 90 per cent. There was a great difference in the character of the two places. Edinburgh was residential and contained a large professional class, whilst Leith was more a population consisting of commercial and industrial people. Leith did not want to join with Edinburgh, and Edinburgh had made no sign whatever that she wanted Leith to join her. Leith would gain £5,000 by joining with Edinburgh, but they were willing to sacrifice that because they believed that they could conduct their education better themselves. He begged to move his Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 3, after the word 'Edinburgh,' to insert the word 'Leith.'"—(*Colonel Denny.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'Leith' be there inserted."

MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY said he was not going to follow his hon. and gallant friend in his panegyric of the various qualities of Leith. He understood that for the most part the children of Leith went to the secondary schools at Edinburgh.

*COLONEL DENNY: That was so at one time, but it is not so now.

MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY said there was only one school in Leith which was worthy of the name of a secondary school. Anybody who knew the circumstances of Edinburgh and Leith knew that there was no neighbourhood in Scotland where they were more likely to run rival educational establishments. It was perfectly well known that the opinion of the Edinburgh School Board was entirely in favour of the propositions made in this Bill. He did not think that he needed to say very much more upon this subject. He regarded this not as a stronger but as a much weaker case than that of Govan, and he should be very much surprised indeed if the Committee accepted this Amendment.

MR. THOMAS SHAW (Hawick Burghs) said Edinburgh was splendidly supplied with regard to appliances for secondary education, and he wanted to know from the mover of the Amendment whether his proposal to separate Leith from Edinburgh would involve the depriving of Leith children of the benefits of Edinburgh secondary education. On the other hand, he would like to know from the Government whether, if the incorporation took place, the population of Leith would be thereby entitled to share in those splendid endowments with which Edinburgh was provided. If Leith were convinced that she would share the fortunes of Edinburgh in that respect, he thought they would find Leith willing to accept the proposal in the Bill. If Leith, by entering into the school board area of Edinburgh, were also to enter into joint inheritance of those splendid endowments, he could imagine nothing better than that Leith should join Edinburgh.

*MR. McCRAE (Edinburgh, E.) hoped the Committee would not accept the Amendment. It was a curious thing that an East of Scotland Member could not be found to state the claim of Leith in this matter, and that those who objected to the proposal in the Bill should have to go to the West of Scotland to get one to advocate the case of Leith. He thought the Secretary for Scotland had made out a good case for the inclusion of Leith in Edinburgh. There was really no physical distinction between Edinburgh and Leith. The boundaries were conterminous and for the sake of uniformity of administration and having regard to the fact that this amalgamation would be a financial gain to Leith, the proposal in the Bill was a good one. The hon. Member for Kilmarnock stated the amount per head spent on education in Leith, but he did not inform the House as to the rates for education in Edinburgh and Leith respectively. If he had done so, the Committee would have found that the rates of Edinburgh were considerably less than those of Leith. He thought that the Leith people admitted frankly there would be a financial gain to them if Leith were included in Edinburgh. The hon. and learned Member for the Border Burghs wished to know whether the children of Leith would under the Bill have the benefits enjoyed by those of Edinburgh. This Bill would give them all those benefits with one exception, and he asked the Secretary for Scotland whether it would not be possible to put that right in the Bill. Heriot's Foundations were only applicable to Edinburgh children. Could these not be extended in some way to Leith children? Prior to 1833 they were eligible, because the area was then under one municipality. Therefore, it would be only reverting to the old state of things if that privilege were again given to Leith. With regard to any debt that had been incurred by Leith, he thought it would be an injustice, as was at first proposed, that they should be called upon to bear the whole responsibility of that. The Bill had been very much improved by providing that any debt would be jointly borne by the new area, whatever it might be. He thought that was a sound financial principle. Looking to the whole facts of the case he thought there could be no doubt that, if they considered economy and uniformity of administration, the proper course was to approve of the clause as it appeared in the Bill.

*MR. DOBBIE (Ayr Burghs) said the public bodies of Leith were practically unanimous against the proposal in the Bill. He agreed with the mover of the Amendment that there was a stronger case here than with regard to Govan. There was at present no educational connection between Edinburgh and Leith, and there was no municipal connection. Quite the opposite. He differed from the Secretary for Scotland in the view he expressed regarding the efficiency of the machinery for secondary and technical education in Leith. His information was that Leith in many respects was better equipped than Edinburgh in regard, particularly, to technical education. When they considered that Leith had a population of 80,000, and that the children attending its schools numbered 12,000, he thought the Committee must have strong reasons stated to persuade them to take a course contrary to the wishes of the ratepayers. He knew a district in Argyllshire which would have a new school board where the population was only 7,339, and the children attending school numbered only 550. If such a place was to have a school board, Leith ought to have one. This was a matter which should be tested only by school efficiency, and, that being so, Leith would compare favourably in regard to taxable area and population, and the number of scholars was more than two-thirds of the boards to be established under this Bill. He suggested that Leith should be allowed to have a school board, and that if an amalgamation was to take place i tshould not be by means of a proposal emanating from the Government, but only when supported by the great body of opinion in Leith, and after terms had been adjusted.

MR. MUNRO FERGUSON (Leith Burghs) said the case for Leith had been admirably put by the hon. Member opposite. He thought the amalgamation which was proposed, except in the case of the four excluded burghs, was sound educationally, and would prevent overlapping. He voted for including Govan in Glasgow, believing that more efficient education would be got under the proposal in the Bill. He had often complained of the extreme autocracy of the Scottish Education Department, and he believed that the two main securities in the Bill for local freedom were the two great education authorities which would be set up in Glasgow and Edinburgh. He believed it would be less possible in future for the Education Department to override those great local authorities than it had been hitherto, and that the local liberty which would find expresssion in these bodies would be the standard by which the local liberty of the smaller bodies would be expressed. The inequalities of local burdens in different areas had been the subject of frequent complaint. This Bill tended to mitigate these inequalities. It would tend to mitigate them in the case of Edinburgh and Leith. Leith would certainly derive some financial advantage under the Bill. Grants in aid would be withdrawn from Leith, and the rating burden would become heavier. Personally, he should be glad to see some of that burden extended over the wealthier region of Edinburgh. He did not find it possible to support the elimination of one burgh because he happened to represent it in that House, and, though he knew the views of the local authorities were against amalgamation, he was of opinion that considerable advantages would result from it. Leith School Board had done extremely good work, and the only ground on which he was opposed to the local authorities was the general one which he had advanced, and which, he thought, sufficiently justified the passing of the clause as it stood.

MR. CALDWELL said he had very great sympathy with Leith on this question. What was being done in the case of Leith illustrated the great change which was being made in Scotch educational management. In this case they were proposing to go against the sentiment of the place. Leith objected to being annexed to Edinburgh, either for municipal or educational purposes; and he must say it was a very strong step indeed for this House to insist upon their being amalgamated for educational purposes without any further inquiry. What was the ground of the amalgamation? It was not alleged that Leith was deficient in elementary or secondary education. It was said they wanted to combine a certain amount of secondary education between Leith and Edinburgh. That was to say, the whole local interest of the burgh of Leith was to be subordinated for the sake of a few people who wanted to get secondary education. No doubt Leith would have a certain amount of representation on the board to be set up, but it would be minority representation. It seemed ridiculous that the control of education should be taken from the people of the burgh, and practically handed over to another district, merely because that district happened to be larger. Even under the scheme proposed in the Amendment of the Secretary for Scotland they could not bring about an amalgamation except upon the initiative of the local authority. There was no initiative here. There was absolute opposition. He thought that Leith had a stronger claim for separation from Edinburgh than Govan had for separation from Glasgow.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 36; Noes, 171. (Division List No. 148.)

AYES.

Ainsworth, John Stirling
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Caldwell, James
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Dalziel, James Henry
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert Jn.
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Horniman, Frederick John
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lough, Thomas
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Maxwell, W.J.H.(Dumfriessh.)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Reid, James (Greenock)
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Russell, T. W.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, D. Alfred (Merthyr)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, Jn. Cathcart (Orkney)
Weir, James Galloway
White Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Colonel Denny and Mr. Dobbie.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O.
Asher, Alexander
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J.(Manch'r
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W. (Leeds
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Black, Alexander William
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boland, John
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt.Hn.J.A.(Glasgow
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Chapman, Edward
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Crombie, John William
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cullinan, J.
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny N.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott

Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Doogan, P. C.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Dunn, Sir William
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Ellice, Capt. E.C(SAndrw'sBghs
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fergusson, Rt.Hn.Sir J.(Manc'r
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir RobertPenrose-
Forster, Henry William
Foster, P. S. (Warwick, S.W.)
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gore, Hn G.R.C.Ormsby-(Salop
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Gretton, John
Hain, Edward
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hammond, John
Hardy, Laurence(Kent, Ashford
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hayden, John Patrick
Heath, Arthur Howard(Hanley
Henderson, Sir A.(Stafford, W.
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hope, J.F.(Sheffield, Brightside
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Joyce, Michael
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Kilbride, Denis
Knowles, Sir Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.)
Lawson, J. Grant (Yorks., N.R.
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S
Long, Rt. Hon. W. (Bristol, S.)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J.(Portsmouth
Lundon, W.
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Crae, George
M'Iver, Sir Lewis(Edinburgh, W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Malcolm, Ian
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Milner, Rt.Hn.Sir Frederick G.
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Mount, William Arthur
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute)
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nicholson, William Graham
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid.)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kelkenny)
O'Malley, William
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Pease, Herb. Pike (Darlington
Percy, Earl
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Pym, C. Guy
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Renwick, George
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rose, Charles Day
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stock, James Henry
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Sullivan, Donal
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tuff, Charles
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Wallace, Robert
Walrond, Rt.Hn.Sir WilliamH.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col. A.C.E(Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G.E.(Notts.
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wodehouse, Rt.Hn. E.R.(Bath
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

Amendment proposed.

In page 2, line 9, after the words 'Kinning Park,' to insert the word 'Rutherglen.'"—(*Colonel Denny.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'Rutherglen' be there inserted."

MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY said he accepted the Amendment.

MR. CALDWELL said he understood that the Secretary for Scotland accepted the inclusion of Rutherglen in the Glasgow School Board district because the people of that burgh were agreeable. In this case consent was made the ground of annexation, whereas in the case of Leith and Govan the annexation was made whether the people wished it or not. He thought the wishes of the local authority should have been respected in the one case as well as in the other.

MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY said there was a confusion of mind on the part of the hon. Gentleman. The question to be decided in the case of Leith was whether that burgh should be a separate enumerated district, whereas in the case now before the Committee the point was whether Rutherglen should be in the Glasgow district or in the Lanarkshire district. There was no co-relation whatever betweeen the two cases. Not only were the parties in Rutherglen willing to be joined to the Glasgow district, but on educational grounds it was highly expedient.

MR. BRYCE said that as his hon. and gallant friend who moved the Motion represented the burgh of Rutherglen, he thought that the Committee could not go wrong in accepting it. He must, however, express his surprise that Rutherglen was content to be annexed to Glasgow. Rutherglen, or rather Ruglen, was an older town than Glasgow. There was the ancient distich which ran:—

> "Ruglen was a toun when Glasgow was nane,
> And Ruglen will be a toun when Glasgow is gaue."

MR. HALDANE (Haddingtonshire) said he rejoiced that the right hon. Gentleman had referred to the historic associations of Ruglen; it was an abuse of pronunciation to call it Rutherglen. Why was it that Ruglen was not originally included in the Glasgow instead of being included in the Lanarkshire district? There was a presumption that it was quite right to include it in the Glasgow district from the fact that the hon. and gallant Member who represented the burgh had advocated it.

MR. THOMAS SHAW said his right hon. friend had mistaken the position in regard to Ruglen and Glasgow altogether. The real object of Ruglen in this matter was not far to seek; it wanted to annex Glasgow, and he saw no reason why anybody outside should object to that arrangement. Seriously, his view was that all suburban districts should be attached to their educational centre. On that ground he had voted for Govan being annexed to Glasgow, and Leith to Edinburgh. That position was sufficient to justify the Government in accepting the Amendment.

Question put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed.

"In page 2, lines 9 and 10, to leave out the words 'and Pollokshaws."'—*Sir Charles Renshaw.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

*SIR CHARLES RENSHAW said he wished to know why Pollokshaws should be included in Glasgow. It might be no doubt convenient to the children in some part of Pollokshaws, but for the educational interests of the children who lived in the county to the south of Pollokshaws the arrangement would be extremely inconvenient. Why was it that this change had been made without any consultation with those responsible for the education of that district?

MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY said that the Department had consulted the educational authorities of Pollokshaws, and they wanted to be included in the Glasgow district.

Question put, and agreed to.

MR. CHARLES DOUGLAS (Lanarkshire, N.W.) said he had an Amendment on the Paper to insert after "Pollokshaws," "and the parts of the parishes of Govan and Springburn which are not included in those burghs." He would not move this Amendment, as he understood the Secretary for Scotland was going to consider it.

Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY said he would consider it, but the probability was that he would not accept it.

Question proposed, "That Clause 3, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

Dr. MACNAMARA said he was bound again to ask a Question as to which he had hitherto been unable to get an answer from the Government. He wanted to know why the Government had determined to retain the school board system in Scotland after having destroyed it in England and Wales? When the English Education Bill was before the House, he pleaded with the Government to amalgamate the small school boards, and give the new boards suitable areas, but scorn was poured upon him for making that proposal. The Prime Minister, whom he was sorry not to see in his place, told the House on the London Bill that he was clearly of opinion that it was a most retrograde policy to support the principle of an *ad hoc* authority. If it was a retrograde policy in 1903, why was it not so in 1904? The President of the Local Government Board had said that for good or evil the Government had decided to support no longer the *ad hoc* principle. Why were they supporting it there to-night? The Vice-President of the Committee of Council had stated that the Government thought an *ad hoc* authority was an anachronism. If it was an anachronism in 1902, what was it in 1904? It must be more than an anachronism. The condemnation of the *ad hoc* principle in 1902 and 1903 was absolute and unreserved, and the school board system was denounced as the most reactionary, extravagant, and hopeless system that an offended deity had ever thrust upon the country. Why was it different now? If it was all wrong for England, why was it all right for Scotland? He put this Question quite seriously, and would go on asking it, and he was entitled to an answer.

Mr. J. A. PEASE (Essex, Saffron Walden) said that the Question of the hon. Gentleman was a very pertinent one, and it appeared to him that he was entitled to some reply. English Members who were obliged to attend to their duties in the House desired to vote on sound principles in connection with education in Scotland; and they were anxious to hear from the Government why a change of front had been adopted in this matter of school boards and the *ad hoc* principle. Had the Government any reason to distinguish the people of Scotland from those of England and Wales? The latter were equally entitled to the control of their educational system as the people of Scotland.

Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY said he was told that the hon. Member for Camberwell would go on asking Questions. There were many people who went through life like that. He would have thought that really the hon. Gentleman would have been rather glad at last to find that somebody appreciated all the things he had said years ago. In answer to the hon. Member for Saffron Walden, he should be very glad to take his education in hand out in the lobby, and show him how the Government had to come to a different decision on a practical matter in Scotland and England. To begin with, in Scotland they had universal school boards, and in England they had not. He had explained fully on the Second Reading what the considerations were which led the Government, in accordance to what he believed to be the majority of Scotch opinion, to frame a different scheme for the different circumstances of Scotland, to that which had been passed for England and Wales.

And it being Midnight, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again To-morrow.

SITE FOR DUKE OF YORK'S SCHOOL BILL [LORDS].

[SECOND READING.]

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. A. Graham Murray.

LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley) said he hoped that the House would give him the Second Reading of this Bill, and let it be referred to a Select Committee. The Bill made no charge on the public accounts, and it was really important that the building operations should be begun as soon as possible.

MR. WHITLEY (Halifax) said that certain rights of way were to be interfered with in an irregular fashion, and he really thought that the Bill ought to be taken when a few minutes could be spared to discuss it.

Second Reading deferred till To-morrow.

Adjourned at seven minutes after Twelve o'clock.

[APPENDICES.

APPENDIX I

PUBLIC BILLS

DEALT WITH IN VOLUME CXXXV.

Those marked thus * are Government Bills. The figures in parentheses in the last column refer to the page in this volume. "[H.L.]" following title indicates that the Bill originated in the Lords.

(A.) HOUSE OF LORDS.

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
Bills of Exchange Act (1882) Amendment [H.L.]	*Lord Chancellor*	Report 17th May (5) Read 3^a and passed 19th May (309)
*Light Railways [H.L.]	*Lord Wolverton*	Read 1^a 19th May (309)
*Married Women's Property Act (1882) Amendment [H.L.]	*Lord Chancellor*	Read 1^a 17th May (5)
Merchant Shipping Act (1894) Amendment [H.L.]	*Lord Muskerry*	Read 1^a 10th June (1327)
*Naval and Military Medals [H.L.]	*Earl of Donoughmore*	Read 1^a 10th June (1327)
Prevention of Corruption [H.L.]	*Lord Alverstone*	Report 17th May (5) Read 3^a and passed (309)
*Prize Courts [H.L.]	*Lord Chancellor*	Report 17th May (5) Read 3^a and passed 19th May (309)
*Reserve Forces [H.L.]	*Earl of Donoughmore*	Read 1^a 10th June (1327)
*Seamen and Soldiers False Characters [H.L.]	*Earl of Donoughmore*	Read 1^a 17th May (5) Read 2^a 7th June (912) Committee 9th June (1185)
Street Betting [H.L.]	*Lord Davey*	Report 19th May (309) Read 3^a and passed 7th June (913)
Weights and Measures (Metric System)	*Lord Belhaven and Stenton*	Read 3^a and passed 17th May (11)

(B.) HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
*Aliens	*Mr. Akers Douglas*	Motion to commit to Standing Committee 8th June (1084)
*Alkali, etc., Works	*Mr. Walter Long*	Read 1^a 17th May (47)

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
*Anglo-French Convention	*Earl Percy*	Read 1° 17th May (48) Read 2° 1st June (499)
Architects Registration	*Mr. Atherley-Jones*	Read 1° 17th May (48)
Carriers Act (1830) Amendment	*Mr. Bill*	Read 1° 9th June (1235)
County Courts (Admiralty Jurisdiction)	*Sir Albert Rollit*	Read 1° 6th June (808)
*Dean Forest	*Mr. Victor Cavendish*	Read 1° 17th May (48) Read 2° 7th June (1039)
*Education (Scotland)	*Mr. A. Graham Murray*	Committee 13th June (1505) (1573)
*Finance	*Mr. Austen Chamberlain*	Second Reading 17th May (57) (113) Second Reading 18th May (186)
Home Industries	*Col. Denny*	Bill withdrawn 8th June (1180)
Housing of the Working Classes (Rural Districts)	*Sir Walter Foster*	Read 1° 17th May (48)
*Indian Councils	*Mr. Brodrick*	Second Reading (adjourned) 1st June (609)
*Judicature and Development Grant (Ireland)	*Mr. Wyndham*	Read 1° 19th May (368)
*Licensing	*Mr. Akers Douglas*	Committee 6th June (808) (870) Committee 7th June (934) (994) Committee 8th June (1173)
*Lunacy	*Sir Robert Finlay*	Read 1° 18th May (186)
Municipal Franchise (Companies)	*Sir Albert Rollit*	Read 1° 6th June (808)
Musical Copyright	*Mr. Mount*	Consideration 10th June (1372)
*Naval Works (Portsmouth Barrack Site)	*Mr. Arthur Lee*	Read 1° 17th May (47)
*Penal Servitude	*Mr. Akers Douglas*	Read 2° 3rd June (721)
Poor Law Officers Superannuation (Scotland)	*Mr. Maxwell*	Read 1° 17th May (48)
Port Sanitary Authorities Expenses	*Mr. Plummer*	Read 1° 9th June (1235)
*Post Office Sites	*Lord Stanley*	Read 1° 2nd June (632)

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
Public Entertainments	*Capt. Jessel*	Read 1° 9th June (1235)
Sea Fisheries [H.L.]	*Mr. Fellowes*	Read 1° 18th May (185)
Shipowners' Negligence (Remedies)	*Sir Harry Samuel*	Read 1° 6th June (808)
Shop Hours	*Mr. Cochrane*	Second Reading 1st June (577) (582)
Street Traffic Regulations	*Mr. Shackleton*	Read 1° 9th June (1235)
Weights and Measures (Metric System) [H.L.]	*Sir William Holland*	Read 1° 9th June (1234)

APPENDIX II.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, SESSION 1904.

LIST OF RULES, ORDERS, &c., which have been presented during the Session, and are required by Statute to lie for an appointed number of Days upon the Table of the House.

[*In continuance of List given in preceding Volume.*]

Title of Paper.	Date from which the Period runs.	Period to lie upon the Table.
Union of Benefices Act (Saint John, Fitzroy Square, with Saint Saviour, Fitzroy Square),—Copy of Scheme under The Union of Benefices Act, 1860, for effecting an Union of the Benefices of Saint John, Fitzroy Square, with Saint Saviour, Fitzroy Square [23 and 24 Vic., c. 142, s. 15]	17 May	Two months
Intermediate Education (Ireland),—Copy of Rules and Programme of Examinations for 1905 [41 and 42 Vic., c. 66, s. 6]	19 May	40 days
Public Records (Home Office),—Copy of Schedule containing a List and Particulars of Classes of Documents which were returned to the Office of His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Home Department, and which are now in the Public Record Office, but which are not considered of sufficient public value to justify their preservation therein [40 and 41 Vic., c. 55, s. 1]	6 June	4 weeks
Prisons (Rules for Convict Prisons),—Copy of Draft of New Rules proposed to be made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department for the Government of Convict Prisons [61 and 62 Vic., c. 41, s. 2 (2)]	6 June	30 days (whilst the House is sitting)
Universities of Oxford and Cambridge Act, 1877 (Oxford),—Copy of Statute made by the Governing Body of Trinity College, Oxford, on 26th February 1904, amending Statute VI. of the Statutes of the College [40 and 41 Vic., c. 48, s. 50.]	8 June	12 weeks

INDEX

TO THE

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

[AUTHORISED EDITION].

SIXTH VOLUME OF SESSION 1904.

MAY 17—JUNE 13.

EXPLANATION OF ARRANGEMENT AND ABBREVIATIONS.

Bills: Read First, Second, or Third Time = 1R., 2R., 3R. [*c.*] = Commons. [*l.*] = Lords. *Amendt.* = Amendment. *Os.* = Observations. *Qs.* = Questions. *As.* = Answers. *Com.* = Committee. *Con.* = Consideration. Where in the Index * is added with Reading of a Bill, or a Vote in Committee of Supply, it indicates that no Debate took place on that Stage of the Bill, or on that Vote. Subjects discussed in Committee of Supply are entered under their headings, and also under Members' Names, without reference to the actual Vote before the Committee.

Abraham, Mr. W. [Cork Co., N.E.]
  Bank of Ireland—Land Purchase Act of 1903, Balances under—Arrangements as to Interest, *June 1*, 496.
  Kingston Estate—Dispute as to Terms of Sale — Bringing the Matter under Notice of Commissioners, *May 19*, 363, 364.
  Provincial Bank of Ireland, Government Monies passing through, Weekly Balances held, etc. — Approximating Irish to Scotch System, *June 8*, 1050-1051.

Abraham, Mr. W. [Glamorgan, Rhondda]
  Shop Hours Bill, 2R., *June 1*, 586.

Accidents
  Mines and Quarries
    Foreign and Colonial—General Report and Statistics Presented, *May 17*, 428.
    United Kingdom—Report and Statistics Presented, *June 2*, 618; *June 7*, 908.
  Railway—General Report Presented, *May 17*, 4, 28.

Accounts, Public
  Committee Report Presented, *June 10*, 1365.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir A.—*Parliamentary Secretary of the Treasury* [Somerset, Wellington]
  Custom's Boatmen—Method of Appointment, Pay, etc., *May 31*, 457.
  Licensing Bill—Committee Stage, Date of taking, *May 19*, 420.

Acton Improvement Bill
  l. Rep.* *June 7*, 905.
  3R.* *June 10*, 1325.

Adams Estate, near Cork
  Tenants' Refusal of Landord's Terms of Sale—Individual Application for Reinstatement.
    Q. Mr. Flynn; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 19*, 344.

Adjournments of the House
  Whitsuntide Recess.
    Motion [Sir A. Acland-Hood], *May 19*, 369.

Admiralty
  First Lord—Earl of Selborne.
  Financial Secretary—Mr. E. G. Pretyman.
  Buildings, Old, Reason for pulling down part — Erecting New Government Office on Site.
    Q. Sir J. Leng; *A.* Lord Balcarres, *May 17*, 41.

Afghanistan

Amir of, Allowance from the Indian Government to—Refusal, alleged.
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill ; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 13*, 1476.

Kabul, British Mission to, Information as to sending.
Q. Mr. Boland ; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 9*, 1220, 1221.

Africa, British Central

Nyassa, Lake, Steamer for—Difference in prices quoted by Private Firm and the Crown Agents.
O. Duke of Marlborough, *June 10*, 1353, 1354.

Africa, East

Administration of, Date of transferring, from Foreign to Colonial Office.
Qs. Mr. H. Samuel, Mr. C. Wason ; *A.* Earl Percy, *June 7*, 926–927.

Alienation of territory in—Protests against.
Os. Mr. C. Wason, *June 9*, 1294, 1296 ; Earl Percy 1295 1296, 1319.
Qs. Mr. C. Wason ; *As.* Earl Percy, *May 17*, 39 ; *June 9*, 1222.

Jewish Settlement, proposed Cession of Territory for—Appointing Independent Commission of Inquiry.
Qs. Mr. C. Wason ; *As.* Earl Percy, *May 17*, 39 ; *June 9*, 1222.
Os. Mr. C. Wason, *June 9*, 1294–1296 ; Earl Percy, 1295, 1296.

Somaliland, *see that title.*

Uganda, Administration of, Date of transferring, from Foreign to Colonial Office.
Qs. Mr. H. Samuel, Mr. C. Wason ; *A.* Earl Percy, *June* 7, 926–927.

Africa, South

Cape Four per cent. Stock—Deductions from Dividends on account of Income Tax.
Os. Mr. Weir, *May 31*, 482, 487 ; Mr. V. Cavendish, 487.
Q. Mr. Weir ; *A.* Mr. Cavendish, *June* 7, 928.

Transvaal, Rhodesia, etc., *see those titles.*

Africa, West

Congo, *see that title.*

Gold Coast, *see that title.*

Ibibio Country, Military Patrol through—Reason for Attack on Natives.
Q. Mr. T. W. Russell ; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *June 2*, 619–620.

Iles de Los—Cession of, to France by Great Britain under the Arbitration Treaty.
Os. Earl Percy, *June 1*, 500 ; Mr. J. Walton, 560.

Revenue and Expenditure and Trade—Statement presented, *June 6*, 775 ; *June 7*, 910.

Africa, West—*cont.*

Senegambia—Extension of colony of to include Yarbutenda under Arbitration Treaty with France.
O. Earl Percy, *June 1*, 501.

Agriculture, Board of

President—Earl of Onslow.

Agriculture

Railway rates and facilities for Produce, *see under* Railways—Rates.

Seeds, Adulteration of, Cases of—Suggested Amendment of Law.
Q. Mr. Spear ; *A.* Mr. Fellowes, *May 18*, 180–181.

Agriculture and Technical Instruction Department, Ireland

President—Mr. G. Wyndham.

Animals, Diseases of—Report (1903) presented, *May 31*, 426 ; *June 7*, 909.

Athlone—Minute sanctioning form of instruction, presented, *June 6*, 775 ; *June 7*, 912.

Clare Committee—Reason for non-appointment of Miss Freeman as Instructress in Butter-making, etc.
Q. Mr. W. Redmond ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 19*, 351–352.

Cork—Minutes sanctioning form of instruction, presented, *June 6*, 775 ; *June 7*, 912.

Loans from, in Aid of Irish Industries—Nature of Security.
Q. Mr. Brigg ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 3*, 719–720.

Loch Leven Trout, Arranging to lay down, in the Upper Bann River.
Q. Mr. MacVeagh ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 3*, 719.

Veterinary Branch, Memorial of Officers in Delay in answering, cause of.
Q. Mr. MacVeagh ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 3*, 718.

Refusal of Chief Clerk to forward.
Qs. Mr. Delany, Mr. Sloan, Mr. Flavin ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 18*, 183.

Ainsworth, Mr. J. S. [Argyll]

Education [Scotland] Bill, com., *June 13*, 1519, 1533, 1551.

Income Tax—Method of Collection in England and in Scotland, *May 31*, 486.

Alexandra (Newport and South Wales) Docks and Railway Bill.

c. 1R.* *May 17*, 27.

Aliens Bill

Committee, Referring to — Question of postponing Bill.
Q. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman ; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 2*, 630–631.

[*cont.*

Aliens Bill—*cont.*
- *Debate on Motion to commit to Standing Committee on Law, June 8*, 1084.
  - Abuse of System of referring Bills to Standing Committees, 1103–1105, 1107, 1111, 1120, 1123.
  - Advantages of, and necessity for, discussing in Committee of whole House, 1097, 1098, 1103, 1117, 1123.
  - Alterations in the Public Policy of the Country embodied in, 1085, 1086, 1092, 1097, 1098, 1121.
  - Amendments to the Bill, Number of, 1086, 1094.
  - Bankruptcy Bill, Precedent of, 1113, 1116, 1119.
  - Class of Bill which should be remitted to Standing Committees, 1087, 1090, 1099–1105, 1108, 1111–1115, 1124, 1125.
  - Contentious Nature of the Measure, 1092–1094, 1096, 1097, 1100, 1106–1111, 1119, 1121–1123, 1126.
  - Deceased Wife's Sister Bill, Precedent of, 1090, 1100, 1106, 1108, 1109, 1118.
  - Delegation or devolution of work of the House to Committees, Principle of, 1113–1116, 1125.
  - Employers' Liability Bill, Precedent of, 1090, 1091, 1094, 1096, 1099, 1112, 1118, 1122.
  - Law Bills, Definition of, 1085, 1091.
  - Procedure of the House, Abuse of, alleged, 1110, 1111, 1117, 1118.
  - Reasons for sending to Standing Committee, *June 8*, 1086–1089, 1091, 1095, 1097, 1098, 1113, 1124, 1127, 1128.
  - Standing Order instituting Grand Committees, Terms of, *June 8*, 1084, 1109.
- Expenses, Committee to consider, *June 2*, 632; *June 8*, 1131, 1169.
  - *Debate* [Commons] *June 8*, 1131.
    - Cost of Administering the Act, Information as to, 1133–1137, 1139, 1141, 1142, 1146–1159.
    - Objects for which Expenses are to be incurred, 1133, 1135, 1141, 1143, 1151, 1155.
    - Provisions of the Resolution, 1132.
    - Resolution, Reasons for not placing terms of, on the Agenda Paper, 1132, 1134–1137, 1139, 1150.
    - Staff.
      - Number of, and Estimate of Cost, etc., 1133 - 1135, 1138, 1139, 1143 - 1145, 1149, 1151, 1157.
      - Women Inspectors, Appointment of, proposed, 1135, 1138.

Alkali, &c., Works Bill
- *c.* 1R.* *May 17*, 47.

Allen, Mr. C. P. [Gloucestershire, Stroud]
- Macedonia—Reforms—Assessors appointed by Austrian and Russian Governments, Tours made by — Tabling Reports from, *June 7*, 926.
- Thames River Steamboat Service Bill, *Con*, *June 2*, 688.

Ambrose, Dr. R. [Mayo, W.]
- Fitzgerald Estate, Mayo, grazing lands on, Securing for Congested Areas, *May 18*, 170; *June 7*, 921.

Amersham, Beaconsfield and District Water Bill
- *l.* 3R.* *May 19*, 306.

Ancient Monuments
- Berwick-on-Tweed Walls, proposed Destruction of—Securing Preservation. *Q.* Mr. Bryce; *A.* Lord Balcarres *June 1*, 496.

Anglo-French Convention Bill
- *c.* 1R.* *May 17*, 48.
  - 2R., *June 1*, 499 [*for* details of debate, *see title* France — Arbitration Treaty with Great Britain].

Animals
- Diseases of, *see that title.*
- Dogs, *see that title.*
- Experiments on.
  - Educational Value of — Report of Royal College of Physicians. *Q.* Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *May 19*, 346.
  - Return as to number performed during 1903.
    - Ordered *May 17*, 30.
    - Presented *May 19*, 342.
- Tuberculosis, *see that title.*

Anson, Sir W. R.—*Parliamentary Secretary, Board of Education* [Oxford University]
- Church Attendance of Children in School Hours, Powers of Managers to compel, etc., *May 18*, 181–182; *June 9*, 1206.
- Devonshire, Geological Survey of—New Survey proposed, *June 13*, 1492.
- Education Board Provisional Orders (Cardiff and Newport Monmouthshire) Bill, 2R., *June 13*, 1564, 1567.
- Grants.
  - Elementary Schools—Effect of Change in Block Grant on Amount earned, etc., *May 19*, 362.
  - System of, under New Code—Substituting for Article 31, Articles 98 and 101 (a) of existing Code, etc., *June 6*, 799, 800.

[*cont.*

Anson, Sir W. R.—*cont.*

Pupil Teachers, Age of Admission as, postponing Regulation fixing, at Sixteen, *June 6*, 782.

Schools.

Elementary, Grants to — Amount earned, Effect of change in Block Grant on, etc., *May 19*, 362.

Political Meetings, use of Buildings for, *June 9*, 1227.

Whitstable Charities, Draft Scheme for—Proposed diverting of Teachers' Salaries for building National School—Withholding Sanction from Scheme, *June 2*, 619.

Antitoxin Serum

Prohibiting Manufacture of—Report of Lister Institute of Preventive Medicine.

Q. Mr. Cameron ; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *May 31*, 428.

Arbitration

Boards of—Report (1903)—Presented *May 31*, 426 ; *June 7*, 910.

Treaty between France and Great Britain, *see under* France.

Architects' Registration Bill

c. 1R* *May 17*, 48.

Ardglass

Herring Fishery Inquiry, Result of.

Q. Mr. MacVeagh ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 2*, 626.

Arklow Harbour

Report of Commissioners presented, *May 17*, 4, 29.

Armagh

Telegraph Office, Hours of Duty in.

Q. Mr. Lonsdale ; *A.* Lord Stanley, *June 2*, 619.

Armaments

Reduction of, by means of Negotiation with Foreign Powers, proposed.

O. Mr. J. Ellis, *May 17*, 12[illegible].

Armenia

Condition of—Steps taken to prevent outbreak of Outrages on Inhabitants.

Os. Mr. Stevenson, *May 19*, 409 ; Earl Percy, 411 ; Mr. Bryce, 416 ; *June 9*, 1316, 1323 ; Earl Percy, 1321-1323.

Army

Secretary of State—Mr. H. O. Arnold-Forster.

Under Secretary—Earl of Donoughmore.

Financial Secretary—Mr. W. Bromley-Davenport.

Army Corps, Number of, in Great Britain and Ireland, etc.

Qs. Col. Nolan, Mr. C. Hobhouse ; *As.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, Mr. Speaker, *June 6*, 789.

Army—*cont.*

Auxiliary Forces.

Reduction of.

Deferring, until after Discussion of whole Scheme of Army Reform.

Q. Mr. C. Warner ; *A* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *June 1*, 498–499.

Policy of.

O. Lord Lovat, *May 19*, 311.

(*see also titles* Militia, Volunteers *and* Yeomanry).

Command Districts, Organisation of.

Report of Departmental Committee, Publishing.

Q. Mr. C. Hobhouse ; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *June 8*, 1057.

South Wales and Monmouthshire, Creating Separate Command for.

Q. Mr. D. A. Thomas ; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *May 17*, 38.

Compulsory Service, *see that title.*

Condition of, in 1895, References to, in debate on the Finance Bill, *May 17* 74, 77.

Defence of the Empire, *see that title.*

Enfield Small Arms Factory.

Average amount of work at.

Q. Capt. Norton ; *A.* Mr. W. B. Davenport, *June 13*, 1480.

Buildings and Plant, Additions to, since 1890—Statistics as to Rifles, Workmen and Wages.

Q. Mr. Shackleton ; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *June 8*, 1054–1055.

Discharged Workmen, Gratuities to, Delay in payment of.

Q. Capt. Norton ; *A.* Mr. W. B. Davenport, *June 13*, 1479.

Slackness of Work, Distress due to—Giving Larger Proportion of Work to Enfield than to Private Contractors, etc.

Qs. Capt. Norton, Mr. J. Collings, Mr. Crooks ; *A.* Mr. Bromley Davenport, *June 8*, 1058-1059.

Enteric Fever, Inoculation Against, tabling Report of Committee of Inquiry.

Q. Mr. E. Wason ; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *June 6*, 788–789.

Expenditure, Increase in.

Proportion Due to Increased Pay and Improved Barrack Accommodation.

Q. Mr. A. K. Loyd ; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *May 19*, 356.

Reduction of Expenditure, proposed, References to, in Debate on the Finance Bill, *May 17*, 58, 65, 87, 93, 94, 114, 131, 137, 145.

[*cont.*

Army—*cont.*

Foreign Armies — Expenditure, Normal Annual, of France, Germany, and Russia in twenty-five years.
Q. Mr. Runciman; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *May 18*, 161–162.

Hampshire Regiment, 1st Battalion, Health of—Detention at Aden.
Q. Mr. J. Hutton; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *May 18*, 172.

Indian, *see under* India.

Infantry Sergeants, New Service Cap for, proposed.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *May 18*, 171–172.

Kilbride Camp Canteen Licence, Order for, Signed by two Magistrates in Opposition to their Colleagues, Validity of, etc.
Q. Mr. J. O'Connor; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 2*, 625-626.
Qs. Mr. J. O'Connor, Mr. Cullinan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 6*, 802.

Manœuvres, Draft Order in Council Relative to.
Address to the King, *June 2*, 1200, 1324; Reply, *June 13*, 1417.

Medical Department.
Report (1902) Presented, *June 1*, 493; *June 7*, 909.
Vote, Date of Discussion on.
Q. Dr. Farquharson; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 2*, 631.

Militia, Volunteers, Yeomanry, *see those titles.*

Nursing—Wives and Families of Soldiers in Places Unprovided with Hospitals, Suggestions as to Providing for.
Q. Sir J. Colomb; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *June 6*, 786–787.

Officers.
General Officers Commanding - in - Chief, Pay of.
Q. Mr. C. Hobhouse; *A.* Mr. Arnold - Forster, *June 8*, 1055.
Uniforms—Irish Firms Excluded from Contracts.
Os. Mr. T. M. Healy, *May 18*, 222.

Pensions.
Crimean War—Increase of Amount, proposed.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *June 9*, 1215.
Meath, M., Case of—Reason for Non-Award of Pension.
Q. Mr. Nolan; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *May 19*, 353–354.
Privates and Non-commissioned Officers discharged on Pension after Twenty-one Years Service—Number, etc.
Q. Mr. Nolan; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *May 19*, 354.

Army—*cont.*

Powder, New Government—Results of, compared with those of Cordite 1901 and 1902.
Q. Mr. S. Ormsby-Gore; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *June 8*, 1058.

Recruiting—Three Years System, Effect of—Percentage of Extensions required for Service abroad.
Q. Sir J. Colomb; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *May 18*, 160–161.

Reforms—Proposals of War Office Reconstitution Committee, etc., allowing, Discussion of whole Scheme, before Introduction of Changes.
Q. Mr. C. Warner; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *June 1*, 498–499.

Rifle Ranges—Rugby—Allowing Town Volunteers same Privilege as School Corps—Providing additional Range.
Q. Mr. Corrie Grant; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *May 19*, 353.

Rifles, New, Manufacture of—Number placed with private firms and with Government factories, cost, etc.
Q. Captain Norton; *A.* Mr. W. B. Davenport, *June 13*, 1480.

Roberts, Lord—Pay, Reason for continuance of.
Qs. Mr. Markham, Mr. S. Ormsby-Gore; *As.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *June 9*, 1214.

Sandhurst Military College — Entrance Examination, Syllabus of.
Q. Sir H. Vincent; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *May 19*, 352–353.

Shambles Barracks, Galway, Condemned Buildings of, Steps to dispose of.
Q. Mr. C. Devlin; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *June 6*, 790.

Soldiers.
Dublin, Prohibition from walking in main streets of, Alleged.
Qs. Mr. Sloan, Mr. Nannetti; *As.* Mr. W. B. Davenport, *June 13*, 1482.
Uniform, in, Refusal to admit to Public Places of Amusement.
Qs. Sir C. Rasch, Gen. Laurie, Mr. MacVeagh, Mr. Cullinan; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *June 6*, 788.

Staffordshire, 3rd North Regiment—Alleged wrongful arrest of W. Vernon.
Qs. Mr. Weir; *As.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *June 2*, 621; *June 9*, 1214, 1215.

Uniforms.
Infantry Sergeants, New Service Cap for, proposed.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *May 18*, 171–172.
Irish Firms excluded from Contracts—Circular issued by Commander-in-Chief, etc.
Os. Mr. T. M. Healy, *May 18*, 222.

[*cont.*

Army—*cont.*

- War Office, *see that title.*
- Woolwich Military College—Entrance Examination, Syllabus of.
  - *Q.* Sir H. Vincent; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *May 19*, 352–353.

Army Estimates

- Surpluses on one Vote applied to reduction of another Vote, objections to system. *Os.* Mr. Goddard, *May 17*, 129, 130.

Arnold-Forster, Mr. H. O.—*Secretary of State for War* [Belfast, W.]

- Army Corps, Number of, in Great Britain and Ireland, *June 6*, 789.
- Auxilary Forces, Deferring Reduction of, until after Discussion of Whole Scheme of Army Reform, *June 1*, 499.
- Command Districts, Organisation of.
  - Report of Departmental Committee, Publishing, *June 8*, 1057.
  - South Wales and Monmouthshire, Creating separate Commands for, *May 17*, 38.
- Compulsory Service.
  - Militia Ballot Act, suggested Revival of, as an alternative to, *June 8*, 1058.
  - Recommendations of Norfolk Commission of Inquiry, Government Attitude towards. *June 2*, 621.
- Enfield Ordnance Factory—Buildings and Plant, Additions to, since 1890—Statistics as to Rifles, Workmen, and Wages, *June 8*, 1055.
- Enteric Fever, Inoculation against, tabling Committee Report on, *June 6*, 788, 789.
- Entrance Examinations for Woolwich and Sandhurst, Syllabuses of, *May 19*, 352–353.
- Expenditure, Increase in—Proportion due to increased Pay and Improved Barrack Accommodation, *May 19*, 356.
- Foreign Armies — Expenditure, normal annual of France, Germany, and Russia in twenty-five Years, *May 18*, 162.
- Hampshire Regiment, 1st Battalion, Health of—Detention at Aden, *May 18*, 172.
- Infantry Sergeants, New Service Caps for, proposed, *May 18*, 172.
- Irish Guards—Athletic Sports, Public, at Lea Bridge, Admission to, refused to non-commissioned Officers in Uniform, *June 6*, 787–788.
- Japan, Army of, Cost of, per year since 1899, *June 13*, 1478.
- Militia.
  - Dining Tents, alleged Refusal of Government to Supply, *May 18*, 173; *May 19*, 355.

Arnold-Foster, Mr. H. O.—*cont.*

- Militia—*cont.*
  - Norfolk Commission on — Recommendations, Date of putting in force, *June 13*, 1478.
- Nursing—Wives and Families of Soldiers in Places unprovided with Hospitals, Suggestions as to providing for, *June 6*, 787.
- Officers—Pay of General Officers Commanding-in-Chief, *June 8*, 1055.
- Pensions.
  - Crimean War—Increase of Amount proposed, *June 9*, 1215.
  - Meath, M., Case of—Reason for non-Award of Pension, *May 19*, 354.
  - Privates and non-commissioned Officers discharged on Pension after Twenty-one Years' Service—Numbers, etc., *May 19*, 354.
- Powder, New Government, Results of, compared with those of Cordite 1901 and 1902, *June 8*, 1058.
- Recruiting—Three Years System, Effect of—Percentage of Extensions required for Service abroad, *May 18*, 160–161.
- Reform Proposals of War Office Reconstitution Committee, etc., allowing Discussion of Whole Scheme before Introduction of Changes, *June 1*, 499.
- Rifle Ranges—Rugby — Allowing Town Volunteers same Privilege as School Corps—Providing Additional Range, *May 19*, 353.
- Roberts, Lord—Pay, reasons for continuation of, *June 9*, 1214.
- Shambles Barracks, Galway, condemned Buildings of, Steps to dispose of, *June 6*, 790.
- Soldiers in Uniform, Refusal to admit to Public Places of Amusement, *June 6*, 787–788.
- Staffordshire, 3rd North, Regiment—alleged wrongful Arrest of W. Vernon, *June 2*, 621; *June 9*, 1215.
- Transvaal—Government Stores, Sale of, by Col. Morgan—Government Action, *June 8*, 1057.
- Uniforms—Infantry Sergeants, New Service Caps for, proposed, *May 18*, 172.
- Volunteers.
  - Norfolk Commission on—Recommendations, Date of putting in force, *June 13*, 1478.
  - Training—Cost, additional, annual, to the State by providing out-of-pocket Expenditure of Volunteers, *June 6*, 789–790.
- War Office Clerks, Abstractor, compulsory Retirement of, at Age of Sixty—Civil Service Clerks posted to War Office, etc., *June 1*, 496.

Arran, Earl of

- Land Act, Working of—Agitation and Intimidation by the United Irish League, etc., *June 13*, 1432.

Arryheera, Donegal
Coastguard Station at, Cause of Delay in Erection of Buildings for.
Q. Mr. O'Doherty ; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *June 6*, 777–778.

Ashbourne, Lord—*Lord Chancellor of Ireland.*
Land Act, Ireland, Working of—Agitation and Intimidation by the United Irish League, etc., *June 13*, 1426-1429.

Asiatic Labour
Columbia, British Importation into, Legislation against, Protest from Japan as to.
Q. Mr. C. Devlin; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *June 8*, 1061.
Transvaal, *see that title*—Chinese Labour.

Asquith, Rt. Hon. H. H. [Fife, E.]
Aliens Bill.
Expenses—Resolution as to, *June 8*, 1140.
Motion to commit to Standing Committee on Law, *June 8*, 1096.
Expenditure, Increase in, and growth of Taxation, *May 17*, 132–139.
Finance Bill, 2R, *May 17*, 132.
Fiscal Policy—Attitude of the Government, Criticisms on, *May 18*, 294–300.
Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *June 6*, 824, 825, 844, 845.
Shop Hours Bill, 2R., *June 1*, 580.

Astley Abbotts
Post and Telegraph Office proposed.
Q. Mr. Hunt ; *A.* Lord Stanley, *June 9*, 1226.

Asylums
Lunatic, *see under* Lunatics.

Atherley-Jones, Mr. L. [Durham, N.W.]
Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *June 6*, 903 ; *June 7*, 934.
Musical Copyright Bill, *Con.*, *June 10*, 1380, 1389.
Police Evidence in Cases between Private Litigants, Regulations as to giving—Case of Sievier v. Duke, *May 17*, 40.
Poor Law Expenditure—Omissions from Returns of Inspectors, *June 13*, 1490.

Athlone
Agriculture and Technical Instruction.
Minutes presented, *June 6*, 775 ; *June 7*, 912.

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. J.—*Attorney-General for Ireland* [Londonderry, N.]
Ballinasloe Asylum — Junior Medical Officer — Fixing Maximum Age for Applicants to Post at Forty, *June 8*, 1076.
Labourers (Ireland) Bill—Date of Second Reading, *June 8*, 1076.
Trinity College Lands Commission — Names of Members, *June 8*, 1076.

Attorney-General—*Sir Robert B. Finlay.*

Attorney-General for Ireland — *Mr. J. Atkinson.*

Aughris, Sligo
Pier and Boatslip, Completion of.
Q. Mr. W. McKillop ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 18*, 182.

Australia
Parliament—Resolutions as to Chinese Labour Introduction into the Transvaal—Divisional Figures—Terms.
Q. Mr. J. Ellis ; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 18*, 176–177.
Postage to—Introducing Penny Post.
Q. Sir G. Parker ; *A.* Lord Stanley, *June 8, 1069.*

Automobiles
see Motor Cars.

Avebury, Lord
Cotton, Declaration of, as Contraband of War by the Russian Government, *May 17*, 11.

Balcarres, Lord [Lancashire, Chorley]
Admiralty Buildings, Old, Pulling Down Wall of—Providing Additional Accommodation, *May 17*, 41.
Berwick-on-Tweed Walls, proposed Destruction of—Securing Preservation, *June 1*, 496.
Kensington Gardens.
Fountains in, Reason for Stoppage of, *May 17*, 34.
Sand Ride in, proposed, *June 8*, 1050.
Motor Cars—Regulations in Parks, Speed limit, etc., *June 9*, 1225, 1226.
Parks and Gardens.
Motor Cars, Regulations, Speed limit, etc., *June 9*, 1225, 1226.
Richmond Park, Removing dead limbs and branches from aged oak trees in, *June 6*, 781-782.
Site for Duke of York's School Bill. 2R., *June 13*, 1592.
Victoria and Albert Museum—Building—Number of Men employed, *June 9*, 1205.

Balfour Rt. Hon. A. J.—*First Lord of the Treasury*, [Manchester, E.]
Aliens Bill, Motion to Commit, to Standing Committee on Law, *June 2*, 630, 631 ; *June 8*, 1124.
Anglo-French Convention Bill, 2R., *June 1*, 536, 567-575.
Army Medical Vote, Date of Discussion on, *June 2*, 631.
Bills, Money Clauses in — Estimate of probable expenditure proposed, *June 13*, 1503.

[*cont.*

Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J.—*cont.*

Business of the House, Course of—Replies to Questions and Criticisms, *May 31*, 436; *June 6*, 806; *June 8*, 1081, 1082; *June 9*, 1233, 1234; *June 13*, 1504, 1505.

Compulsory Service—Recommendations of Norfolk Commission of Inquiry, Government Attitude towards, *June 6*, 805.

Cotton Industry, Corners in.

American Preventive Measures, Obtaining and Tabling Information as to, *May 19*, 345.

Zurich Congress Suggestion of International Co-operation to prevent, Governmental Action as to, *June 7*, 933.

Defence of the Empire.

Discussion on, putting down Supplementary Estimate to allow, *June 8*, 1079.

Home Defence, Force to be maintained for, Decision of Defence Committee as to, *June 6*, 805–806.

Expenditure, increase in, and growth of taxation, *May 17*, 139–150.

Finance Bill, 2R., *May 17*, 139.

Date of Discussion on, *June 2*, 631.

Fiscal Policy.

Government Attitude towards the reform proposals, etc., *May 18*, 285–294.

Motion by Mr. Black—Amendment to. Discussion of, Opportunity for, *May 18*, 185; *June 1*, 498.

Terms of—Communicating to the House, *May 17*, 155, 156.

Plain issue shirked by the Government, Alleged, *June 9*, 1231.

Food Supply in time of War—Commission of Inquiry—Terms of Reference, *June 13*, 1501, 1502.

Labourers (Ireland) Bill—Date of Second Reading, *June 8*, 1077, 1078.

Land (Ireland) Bill—Date of Second Reading, *June 8*, 1077, 1078.

Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *June 6*, 830, 832, 836, 851; *June* 7, 948, 1013.

Consideration, Date of, *June 9*, 1233.

Marine Insurance Bill—Date of Re-introduction, *May 19*, 368; *June 13*, 1468.

Nursing, setting up Select Committee on —State Registration of Nurses, *June 6*, 805.

Parliamentary Procedure—New Rules.

Blocking Notices.

Amending Standing Orders governing Motions for Adjournment, etc., *June 2*, 629, 630.

Taking Steps to Prevent, *June 9*, 1230-1232.

Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J.—*cont.*

Parliamentary Procedure — New Rules —*cont.*

Date of Resuming Consideration of, *May 17*, 38.

Working of—Appointment of Committee of Inquiry into, *May 19*, 370–375.

Persia, Anglo-Russian negotiations as to, *June 13*, 1502.

Prevention of Corruption Bill, Date of Second Reading of, *June 7*, 922.

Privileges, Committee of—Nomination of Members proposed, *June 13*, 1502.

Rhodesia, Importation of Chinese Labour to—Consulting Wishes of Rhodesians on — Allowing Opportunity for Discussion, *June 6*, 792–793; *June 8*, 1078, 1079.

Russo - Japanese War — Contraband, Russian Declaration as to, *June 6*, 804.

Salisbury, Marquess of — Erection of Monument to, proposed, *May 17*, 49; *May 18*, 184; *May 31*, 435, 436.

Tibet Expedition, Allowing Opportunity for Discussion of, *May 18*, 184.

Trade Disputes Bill—Date of Third Reading, *June 9*, 1233.

Undersized Fish Bill—Date of Second Reading, *June 7*, 919.

Volunteers, Vote for — Date of taking, making Statement on Norfolk Commission previous to, etc., *June 8*, 1079, 1080.

War Office, Re-constitution Committee, Report of, Date of Discussion on, *June 8*, 1079.

Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W. *President of the Board of Trade* [Leeds, Central]

Ireland — Railways — Employees and Benefit Societies—Conditions imposed by Companies, etc., *June 9*, 1224.

Lights and Lighthouses.

Expenditure by Lighthouse Authorities, Submitting Estimate of, to Board of Trade — Powers of Advisory Committee, etc., *June 8*, 1070.

Light Dues, Reduction in, etc., *May 19*, 360.

Malta—Italian Trade, Value of, in each year, 1898-1902, *May 31*, 431.

Meat—Average Price 1841–45 and 1899–1903—Present Rate of Consumption by Working Class Families, *May 18*, 166-168.

Merchant Shipping.

Rocket and Line Apparatus, Making Compulsory to carry, *May 18*, 170.

"Turbo"—Trial of Chinese Seamen for desertion; Grounds of charge, etc., *June 9*, 1208.

[*cont.*

Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W.—*cont.*
Piers and Harbours—North Devon or Cornwall, Harbour of Refuge on Coast of, *June 8*, 1071.
Railways.
Light—Between Lincoln and Scawby, Promotion of, *June 8*, 1071–1072.
Rates and Transit Facilities for General Merchandise—Appointing Departmental Committee of Inquiry, *May 17*, 39.
Trawling, Illegal—Dealing with seized tackle—Scotch and Irish methods, *June 8*, 1072, 1073.
Woollen Manufacture—Canadian Import Duty, Proposed Rise in—Comparison with Duties Imposed in 1896 and subsequent years, *June 6*, 798.

Ballinasloe
Asylum—Medical Staff.
Junior Assistant Officer — Fixing maximum age for applicants to post at forty.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *June 8*, 1076.
Kirwan, Dr., Sanction of Lord-Lieutenant to Appointment of.
Qs. Mr. Sloan, Mr. T. M. Healy; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 19*, 366–368.
United Irish League Meeting, Language used at—Steps taken to prevent intimidation, etc.
Os. Earl of Westmeath, *May 19*, 330–334; Earl of Denbigh, 336.

Ballyrankin Estate, Wexford
Sale of Interest of Three Tenants to Adjoining Tenant—Sanction of Commissioners.
Q. Mr. W. Redmond; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 31*, 429–430.

Banbury, Sir F. G. [Camberwell, Peckham]
Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *June 6*, 877.
Militia Ballot Act, Suggested Revival of, as an Alternative to Compulsory Service, *June 8*, 1057–1058.
Shop Hours Bill, 2R. *June 1*, 579, 601.
Telephone Service—National Telephone Company, Progress of Negotiations with, *June 8*, 1068.
Thames River Steamboat Service Bill, *Con.* *June 2*, 686, 688, 689.

Banks
Ireland.
Bank of—Balances under Land Purchase Act of 1903—Arrangements as to Interest.
Q. Mr. W. Abraham; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *June 1*, 496–497.
Joint Stock, Irish, Dissatisfaction of, with Arrangements as to Land Purchase Act—Allowing opportunity for discussion.
Q. Mr. J. Redmond; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *June 7*, 931–932.

Banks—*cont.*
Ireland—*cont.*
Provincial Bank of, Government Moneys passing through, Weekly Balances held, etc.—Approximating Irish to Scotch system.
Q. Mr. W. Abraham; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *June 8*, 1050–1052.
Statistics—Report presented, *May 31*, 426; *June 7*, 909.
Savings Banks.
Accounts (1903) presented, *June 13*, 1418, 1466.

Bann River
Upper, Laying down Trout from Loch Leven in.
Q. Mr. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 3*, 719.

Barnard Castle Gas Bill
c. Rep.* *May 17*, 25.

Barnet District Gas and Water Bill
l. 2R.* *May 19*, 306.

Barrow-in-Furness Corporation Bill
c. 2R.* *June 7*, 914.

Barrymore, Lord
Land Act, Working of—Agitation and Intimidation by the United Irish League, etc., *June 13*. 1425, 1426.

Bartley, Sir G. C. T. [Islington, N.]
Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *June 7*, 935.

Bayley, Mr. T. [Derbyshire, Chesterfield]
Coinage, New Silver, Place of Minting, *June 9*, 1205.
Jersey, Frenchwoman banished from—Repatriation *viâ* England—Effect of sentence, *May 18*, 163.
Pemba, Island of, Slavery in—Slave's right to hold property, Ruling of Zanzibar Commissioner as to, *June 8*, 1063.
Post Office.
Oxford Street (No. 10)—Insanitary Condition, alleged, *June 9*, 1206.
Wages—Sir Edward Bradford's Committee, Date of Tabling Report of, *June 2*, 623.
Transvaal, Importation of Chinese Labour to—Provision for restriction to unskilled labour, *June 9*, 1218.
Zanzibar and Pemba, transferring administration of, from Foreign to Colonial Office, *June 7*, 927.

Beach, Rt. Hon. Sir M. H. [Bristol, W.]
Fiscal Policy—Taxation of Food, Attitude of the Government towards, *May 18*, 272.

Bechuanaland Protectorate.
Lands—Order in Council, 1904, Presented, *May 19*, 309, 342.

Bee-keeping, Ireland
Foul brood, Destruction of bees suffering from—Legislation proposed.
Q. Mr Ffrench ; *A.* Mr Wyndham, *June 13*, 1476, 1477.

Beer
Home made, Licence required for Brewing—Regulations as to Employment of Assistance.
Q. Mr. J. A. Pease ; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *June* 8, 1052–1053.

Belfast
Post Office Messengers, Sunday pay of.
Q. Mr. Sloan ; *A.* Lord Stanley, *June 9*, 1226, 1227.
Valuation Appeals, Delay in hearing, proposed.
Qs. Mr. J. Devlin ; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 13*, 1496, 1497.

Belfast Corporation (Tramways) Bill
l. Report of Select Committee, *May 19* 305.
3R.* *June 9*, 1182
c. 1R.* *June 13*, 1463.

Belgium
Congo Natives, Treatment of, *see under* Congo Free State.
Customs Tariff of—Report presented, *June 10*, 1327.

Belhaven and Stenton, Lord
Weights and Measures (Metric System) Bill, 3R., *May 17*, 11.

Bell, Mr. R. [Derby]
Devonport Dockyard — Introduction of Piecework System—Effect on number of men employed, *June 13*, 1469.

Benefices, Union of
St. John and St. Saviour, Fitzroy Square—Scheme presented, *May 17*, 4, 29.

Berwick-on-Tweed
Walls of, Proposed Destruction of — Securing Preservation.
Q. Mr. Bryce ; *A.* Lord Balcarres, *June 1*, 496.

Bethlehem Royal Hospital
Lunacy Act, Violation of — Preventing occurance of similar cases.
Q. Mr. C. Grant ; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *May 18*, 179–180.

Bexhill Water and Gas Bill
l. Rep.* *May 17*, 1.

Bhownaggree, Sir M. M. [Bethnal Green, N.E.]
Imperial Institute, Indian Contributions towards, and benefits derived from, *June 7*, 923–924.
Transvaal, British Indian Traders in, Boer Court decisions against, upheld by Local Government—Action of Colonial Office, etc., *May 19*, 357, 358.

Bignold, Sir A. [Wick Burghs]
Education (Scotland) Bill, *Com.*, *June 13*, 1527.

Bills of Exchange Act (1882) Amendment Bill
l. Rep.* *May 17*, 5.
3R.* *May 19*, 309.

Births
Ireland—Report of Registrar-General (1891–1900) presented, *May 31*, 424 ; *June 7*, 908.

Black, Mr. A. W. [Banffshire]
Fiscal Policy—Taxation of Food, Attitude of the Government towards, *May 18*, 253, 263.

Blake, Mrs. Helen
Estate of, Tracing Heirs to, etc.
Qs. Mr. P. J. O'Brien ; *As.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *June 8*, 1049–1050 ; *June 13*, 1491.

Blaxall, Dr.
Bacteriologist under the Local Government Board—Use of Government lymph, etc., for private profit, alleged
Qs. Mr. Weir, *June 2*, 676, 679 ; Mr. Long, 678.

Blocking Motions
See under Parliamentary Procedure—New Rules.

Blyth and Cowpen Gas Bill
c. Lords' Amendments, *Con.** *May 19*, 338.

Board of Agriculture
See Agriculture, Board of.

Board of Education
See Education, Board of.

Board of Trade
See Trade, Board of.

Boland, Mr. J. [Kerry, S.]
Cooscroum Landing Stage, Improvement made to, Inadequacy of—Providing proper facilities, *May 19*, 364, 401.
Education—Building Plans, Decision as to, *June 9*, 1227.
Education Board Provisional Orders (Cardiff and Newport Monmouthshire) Bill, 2R., *June 13*, 1558.
Egypt and the Soudan, Total Number of British Subjects in—Proportion of Maltese, *May 31*, 431.
Land Act, Working of—Obstruction caused by Trinity College, *May 19*, 401.
Malta.
Constitution of—Changes effected by Letters Patent, 15 April, 1904, *May 31*, 432–433.
Crown Agents, Value of Stores Supplied by, etc., *May 31*, 432.

[*cont.*

Boland, Mr. J.—*cont.*
Malta—*cont.*
Financial Statement, *May 31*, 430.
Press Offences, Law regarding—Trial by Jury, *May 31*, 430–431.
Kabul, British Mission to, Information as to sending, *June 9*, 1220.
Kenmare River, Illegal Trawling by French boats in, *June 9*, 1228.
Valentia—Ferry, provision of, proposed, *June 9*, 1227.
Warden Estate—Applications from evicted tenants, *June 13*, 1493, 1494.

Borneo, British North
Chartered Company, Alleged Illegal Arrest by.
Q. Mr. H. Heaton ; *A.* Earl Percy, *May 17*, 31–33.

Borough Councils
Indebtedness of, Return No. 114 of Session 1904 relating to—Grand Totals of Columns 1 to 11.
Q. Mr. J. Ellis ; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *June 1*, 494–495.

Boscawen, Capt. A. S. T. G. [Kent, Tunbridge]
Education Board Provisional Orders (Cardiff and Newport Monmouthshire) Bill, 2R., *June 13*, 1569.
Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *June 8*, 1174.

Bothwell
Electric Lighting Order — Report presented, *June 9*, 1204 ; *June 10*, 1327.

Bournemouth Corporation (Tramways) Bill
c. 1R.* *May 17*, 27.
2R.* *June 7*, 914.

Bousfield, Mr. W. R. [Hackney, N.]
Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *June 6*, 900.
Musical Copyright Bill, *Com.*, *June 10*, 1396.
Weights and Measures Bill, *Com.*, *June 10*, 1416.

Bowles, Col. H. E. [Middlesex, Enfield]
London Water Act, postponing Appointed Day under, pending Settlement of Appeal Case of New River Company, *June 2*, 618.

Bowles, Mr. T. G. [Lynn Regis]
Aliens Bill.
Expenses—Resolution as to, *June 8*, 1136, 1137.
Motion to Commit to Standing Committee on Law, *Jnne 8*, 1097.
Anglo-French Convention Bill, 2R., *June 1*, 504, 524–536.
Business of the House, Course of, *June 13*, 1504.
Customs Department.
Boatmen, System of Appointment, *May 31*, 449.

Bowles, Mr. T. G.—*cont.*
Customs Department—*cont.*
Port, and Star Allowances, Information as to, *May 31*, 468.
Smugglers, Capture of—Amount of Estimate for, *May 31*, 471.
Staff, increase in, Objections to, *May 31*, 446.
"Enchantress," Admiralty Yacht—Cost, speed trials, etc., *June 9*, 1210 ; *June 13*, 1467.
Estate Duty Office, Changes in Constitution and Working of, *May 31*, 482–484.
Fiscal Policy—Motion by Mr. Black—Amendment by the Prime Minister Opportunity for discussing, *May 18*, 184.
Friendly Societies, Unregistered, Position of—Payment of Income Tax, etc., *May 31*, 477.
Morocco, tabling Franco-Spanish Agreement as to, *June 8*, 1064.
Navy—Submarine A 1, Loss of—Court Martial, Question of holding, *June 13*, 1479.
Parliamentary Procedure.
Adjournments to discuss Urgent Public Business, Amending Standing Orders as to, *June 2*, 630.
New Rules, Working of—Appointment of Committee of Inquiry into, *May 19*, 375-380, 382.
Persia, Anglo-Russian negotiations as to, *June 13*, 1502.
Privileges, Committee of—Nomination of members proposed, *June 13*, 1502, 1503.
Sugar—Brussels Convention.
Countervailing Duties on Sugar from Self-Governing Colonies, *June 9*, 1291, 1292 ; *June 13*, 1488, 1489,
Interpretation of the Treaty—Date of next sitting, etc, *June 9*, 1293, 1294.
Papers relating to, Inaccuracy of, *June 9*, 1291, 1294 ; *June 13*, 1488.
Permanent Commission, Tabling Proceedings and Reports of, *June 9*, 1290, 1291.
Sugared Products, Application to, *June 9*, 1292, 1293 ; *June 13*, 1488, 1489.
Tea, duty on, in Persia—Effect on Importation of Indian Tea, *June 13*, 1487.
Telephone Service — National Telephone Company, submitting Agreement with, to the House, *June 8*, 1069.
Transvaal, British Indian Traders in, Refusal of Trading Licences to, *May 19*, 358.

[*cont.*

Bowles, Mr. T. G.—*cont.*
Undersized Fish Bill—Date of Second Reading, *June 7*, 919.
Vaccination—Forms for Distribution to Parents, printing of, on the Authority of Vaccination Officers, *June 2*, 624.

Boycotting and Intimidation, Ireland
United Irish League, Methods of.
Os. Earl of Westmeath, *May 19*, 330–334; Lord Clonbrock, 334, 335, Earl of Denbigh, 336; Lord Clonbrock, *June 13*, 1419–1422; Lord Barrymore, 1425.

Brigg, Mr. J. [Yorkshire, W.R., Keighley]
Ireland, Industries of, Loans from Congested Districts Board or Agricultural Department in Aid of, etc., *June 3*, 719–720.
Penal Servitude Bill, 2R., *June 3*, 744.

Brighton
Vaccination Regulations—Forms issued by Registrar to Parents of newly-born Infants.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *May 19*, 361.

Bristol Corporation Bill
l. 3R.* *May 17*, 2.
c. 1R.* *May 17*, 27.
2R.* *June 7*, 914.

British Columbia
See Columbia, British

British Guiana
See Guiana, British.

British Honduras
See Honduras, British.

Brixham Gas Bill
l. 3R.* *June 10*, 1325.

Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John F.—*Secretary of State for India* [Surrey, Guildford]
Afghanistan.
Amir of—Alleged refusal of Allowance from Indian Government, *June 13*, 1476.
British Mission to Kabul, Information as to sending, *June 9*, 1221.
Army.
Officers — General Officers — Filling Vacancies, *May 17*, 36.
Organisation and Training, Lord Kitchener's Memorandum on — Tabling Copy, etc., *May 19*, 351.
British Guiana—Ordinance, 1891—Tabling Correspondence between Indian and Colonial Offices, *May 18*, 178.
Competitive Examinations for Public Offices, Abolition of—Application of Rule to Natives—Patronage Regulations, *June 6*, 794–795.

Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John F.—*cont.*
Cotton growing, Existence of Natural Fertilisers in proximity to Land suitable for, *June 3*, 718.
Dhar, Dewan of—Estate of, Inquiry as to Restoration of confiscated portion of, proposed, *June 9*, 1212.
Education, English, Political effect of, *June 9*, 1211.
Goktiek Railway Bridge, Condition of—Name of Constructor, etc., *June 13*, 1475.
Governor-General—Vacation of Office by Absence from India—Acting-Governor, *June 10*, 1372.
Imperial Institute, Contributions towards, and Benefits derived from, *June 7*, 924.
Indian Councils Bill, 2R., *June 1*, 609, 611.
Expenditure under, for Additional Salaries, etc., *June 9*, 1211.
Kabul, British Mission to, Information as to sending, *June 9*, 1221.
McDonnell, Sir A. P., Pay and Services of, during 1903–4, *June 10*, 1370.
North-West Frontier — New Province, Administration of—Cost, etc., *June 9*, 1221.
Official Secrets Bill—Points objected to by Members of Select Committee, *May 19*, 350.
Police Report, Date of Tabling, *May 19* 350.
Tibet Expedition.
Bullets, Explosive, Use of, *June 10*, 1370.
Lhasa, Advance to, Date fixed for—Russian Influence on Negotiations, *June 6*, 794.
Position—British Policy—Reinforcing Troops — Approximate cost up to 1st May, 1904, etc., *May 31* 435.
Russian Assurances as to Interference, Government Acceptation of, *June 8*, 1053.
Tilak, Mr., Case of, Information as to Procedure in, *June 9*, 1221.

Brown, Sir A. H. [Shropshire, Wellington]
Thames River Steamboat Service Bill, *Con.*, *June 2*, 691.

Brown, Mr. G. M. [Edinburgh, Central]
Education Scotland Bill, *com.*, *June 13*, 1551.

Brussels
Sugar Convention, *see under* Sugar.

Bryant & May, Messrs.
Phosphorus Poisoning in Factory of—Death of Employee, Making investigation as to.
Qs. Mr. Crooks, Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *June 8*, 1065–1066.

Bryce, Rt. Hon. J. [Aberdeen, S.]
- Armenia, Disturbed Condition of, *May 19*, 416.
  - Steps taken to prevent Outrages, etc., *June 6*, 795, 796; *June 9*, 1316, 1317, 1323
- Berwick-on-Tweed Walls, Proposed Destruction of—Securing Preservation, *June 1*, 496.
- Blocking Motions, Discussion in the House baulked by, *May 19*, 415.
- Crete, Situation in, *June 9*, 1316.
- Division challenged frivolously—Members requested to rise in their places—Position of Members already in the lobbies, *June 2*, 706.
- Education (Scotland) Bill, *Com.*, *June 13*, 1530, 1538, 1546, 1587.
- Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *June 7*, 967.
- Macedonia — Civil Assessors, Work of, Failure to render Report, etc, *May 19*, 417.
- Transvaal — Chinese Labour Question, *June 13*, 1484.

Brymbo Water Bill
- *c.* 3R.* *May 17*, 23.
- *l.* 1R.* *May 19*, 306.

Buchanan, Mr. T. R. [Perthshire, E.]
- Education (Scotland) Bill, *Com.*, *June 13*, 1508, 1519.
- Perth Quarter Sessions—Justices, etc., number to be summoned, *June 9*, 1209.
- South African War Transports, Date of Tabling Return as to, *June 8*, 1049.

Buckingham
- County Council Rate, Refusal to give details as to—Enforcing information.
  - *Os.* Mr. Alfred Davies, *June 2*, 674; Mr. Long, 678.
  - *Q.* Mr. Alfred Davies; *A.* Mr. Long, *May 19*, 361.

Budget
- Economy, Absence of mention of.
  - *Os.* Sir H. Fowler, *May 17*, 88; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 100.

Bull, Mr. W. J. [Hammersmith]
- London County Council (Tramways and Improvements) Bill, *Con.*, *June 9*, 1303.

Buncrana
- Pier, Inadequacy of, Loss of Herrings caused by—Providing Pier Extension.
  - *Q.* Mr. O'Doherty; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 19*, 343–344.

Burghclere, Lord
- Railway Rates and Transit Facilities.
  - Agricultural Produce—Correspondence between the Board of Agriculture and Railway Companies, *June 9*, 1195–1197.
  - Milk, Sanitary Condition of Vans, etc., *June 9*, 1196.

Burma, Upper
- Goktiek Railway Bridge, Condition of, Name of Firm by whom bridge was constructed, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. W. F. D. Smith; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 13*, 1475.

Burns, Mr. J. [Battersea]
- London County Council (Tramways and Improvements) Bill, *Con.*, *June 9*, 1299, 1307, 1308.
- Thames River Steamboat Service Bill, *Con.*, *June 2*, 691.

Business of the House
- Congested State of.
  - *Os.* Sir C. Dilke, *May 19*, 383, 384; Mr. H. Samuel, 388.
- Course of, *May 19*, 369; *May 31*, 436; *June 6*, 806; *June 8*, 1081, 1082; *June 9*, 1233, 1234; *June 13*, 1504, 1505.

Buxton, Mr. S. C. [Tower Hamlets, Poplar]
- Aliens Bill—Expenses, Resolution as to, *June 8*, 1135, 1157.
- Transvaal
  - Chinese Labour, Importation of.
    - Compounds, Expense of, to be defrayed by Transvaal Government, *May 19*, 389.
    - Ordinance with Regulations and terms of Contract, date of presenting to Parliament, *May 19*, 390.
    - Wage, Rate of, *May 19*, 395
    - White Labour.
      - Effect on — Class of Work open to the Chinese, *June 9*, 1216.
      - Increase in—Alleged Breach of Faith by the Government — Possibility of discussing, *June 9*, 1083
  - Financial Position, Information as to, *June 9*, 1218.

Cahir
- Telephone Exchange, Opening at.
  - *Q.* Mr. Cullinan; *A.* Lord Stanley, *June 6*, 781.

Caldwell, Mr. J. [Lanarkshire, Mid.]
- Customs Department — Capture of Smugglers—Amount of Estimate for, etc., *May 31*, 470.
- Division challenged frivolously—Members requested to rise in their places—Position of Members already in the lobbies, *June 2*, 707.
- Education (Scotland) Bill, *Com.*, *June 13*, 1511, 1521, 1535, 1538, 1539, 1544, 1556, 1582, 1585.
- Indian Councils Bill, 2R., *June 1*, 610.
- Musical Copyright Bill, *Con.*, *June 10*, 1372–1375, 1379, 1386, 1388, 1398, 1405, 1409, 1410, 1415.

[*cont.*

Caldwell, Mr. J.—*cont.*
Penal Servitude Bill, 2r., *June 3*, 728.
Weights and Measures Bill, *Con.*, *June 10*, 1416.

Cambrian Railways Bill
c. 3r*, *May 17*, 23.
l. Commons' Amendments *Con.* May 19*, 307.

Cameron, Mr. R. [Durham, Houghton-le-Spring]
Antitoxin Serum, Prohibiting manufacture of, *May 31*, 428.

Campbell, Mr. John [Armagh, S.]
Congo Free State, Administration of, by the Belgian Government, *June 9*, 1324.
Russo-Japanese War—Naval Mines outside Territorial Limits, Representations to Russian Government as to, etc., *June 2*, 623.

Campbell-Bannerman, Rt. Hon. Sir H. [Stirling Burghs]
Aliens Bill.
Committee, referring to—Question of postponing Bill, *June 2*, 630.
Motion to commit to Standing Committee on Law, *June 8*, 1091.
Anglo-French Convention Bill, 2r., *June 1*, 566.
Asiatic Labour, Introducing, into Different Parts of the Empire without Discussion or Notice in the House, *June 6*, 793.
Business of the House, Course of, *June 6*, 806; *June 8*, 1081, 1082; *June 9*, 1233, 1234; *June 13*, 1504.
Education (Scotland) Bill, *Com.*, *June 13*, 1547, 1548.
Parliamentary Procedure—New Rules.
Blocking Notices.
Amending Standing Orders governing Motions for Adjournment, *June 2*, 629.
Taking steps to prevent, *June 9* 1231.
Working of — Appointment of Committee of Inquiry into, *May 19*, 380–383.
Penal Servitude Bill, Rules under, Publication of, by *The Times* before issuing to Members, *June 8*, 1081.
Salisbury, Marquess of, Erection of Monument to, proposed, *May 17*, 52.
Transvaal, Importation of Chinese Labour to—Provisions for restriction to Unskilled Labour, *June 9*, 1217.
Volunteers—Norfolk Commission, Statement of State Secretary for War on, Allowing Time to reflect on, before Discussion, *June 8*, 1080.

Canada
Immigration.
Frauds as to—Government Action.
Q. Mr. C. Devlin; *A.* Mr A. Douglas, *June 8*, 1064.

Canada—*cont.*
Immigration—*cont.*
Pauper Children from England.
Homes or Schools for, proposal establish.
Os. Mr. H. Samuel, *June 2* 641; Sir J. Gorst, 642.
Number sent from England in 1903.
Q. Mr. H. Samuel; *A.* Mr. W Long, *June 13*, 1473.
Imperial Defence, Contributions towards, Views as to.
Q. Mr. C. Devlin; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *June 2*, 622.
Woollen Goods, Import Duty on, Proposed rise in — Comparison with Duties imposed in 1896 and subsequent years.
Q. Mr. D. A. Thomas; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *June 6*, 798.

Canal Rates and Charges (Regent's Canal) Order Confirmation Bill.
l. 2r.* *May 17*, 3.

Cancer
Increase in—Frozen Meat as a cause, alleged.
O. Mr. A. Davies, *June 2*, 675.

Cape Colony
Legislative Assembly—Chinese Exclusion Bill, Reason for Refusal of Governor's Assent to, etc.
Q. Mr. Swift MacNeill; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *June 10*, 1371, 1372.

Cardiff Railway Bill
c. 2r.* *May 31*, 421.

Carlisle Corporation Bill
c. *Con.* May 31*, 421.
3r.* *June 3*, 713.
l. 1r.* *June 7*, 906.

Carriers Act (1830) Amendment Bill
c. 1r.* *June 9*, 1235.

Carrington, Earl
Yeomanry Horses, Number of, *May 19*, 328.

Carson, Sir E. H.—*Solicitor-General* [Dublin University]
Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *June 7*, 949, 955; *June 8*, 1177.
Musical Copyright Bill, *Con.*, *June 10*, 1379, 1387.

Causton, Mr. R. K. [Southwark, W.]
Customs Department Watchers — Pay, Uniform and Holiday Grievances, *May 31*, 459.

Cavan
Parliamentary election for West Cavan—New Writ issued, *May 31*, 437.

Cavendish, Mr. V. C. W.—*Financial Secretary of the Treasury* [Derbyshire, W.]
- Blake Mrs. Helen, Estate of, Tracing Heirs to, etc., *June 8*, 1049–1050; *June 13*, 1491.
- Cape Four per cent. Stock—Deductions from Dividends on account of Income Tax, *May 31*, 487; *June 7*, 928.
- Civil Service.
  - Clerks.
    - New Class Assistant, replying to Memorials from, *May 19*, 349.
    - Second Division.
      - Promotions of Senior Assistants to Rank of, under Clause 15 of Order in Council 29th Nov. 1898, *June* 6, 778–779.
      - Temporary and Permanent Employment of, Statistics as to, *May 19*, 347–348.
- Coinage, New Silver, Place of Minting, *June 9*, 1205.
- Customs and Excise Department.
  - Boatmen, Duties of—Scale of pay and chances of promotion, etc., *May 31*, 459.
  - Inspection of Luggage.
    - Establishment of Offices in London and Paris, proposed, *May 31*, 466.
    - Inconvenient arrangements at Dover and Newhaven, *May 31*, 442.
  - Outdoor Officers of Excise—Conditions of Service, *May 31*, 484.
  - Port, and Star Allowances, *May 31*, 467–470.
  - Preventive Officers, Pay of, improvement in, proposed—Granting extra pay for Sunday Duty, *May 31*, 459.
  - Smugglers, capture of—Amount of estimate for, etc., *May 31*, 470, 471.
  - Staff—Dismissal of staff engaged to levy the Corn Tax, proposed, *May 31*, 441.
  - Tea, Inspection of—Quantity and quality of tea dealt with, *May 31*, 466.
  - Watchers—Pay, Uniform, and Leave grievances, *May 31*, 460.
- Dog Licences, Fines received in respect of Neglect to take out—Number of Prosecutions 1903 and 1904, *May 31*, 487; *June 8*, 1074.
- Estate Duty Office, Changes in constitution and working of, *May 31*, 484.
- Income Tax, Ireland—Increase in salaries of officials, proposed, *June 13*, 1474.

Cavendish, Mr. V. C. W.—*cont.*
- Ireland.
  - Dublin.
    - College of Science.
      - Architects' Rate of Remuneration, *May 19*, 363.
      - Irish Materials and Workmen, giving Preference to, *June 8*, 1077.
    - Four Courts, expediting Introduction of Electric Light into, *June 7*, 922.
  - Galway.
    - Docks, Lighting of, *June 2*, 627, 628.
    - Drainage of the County, Reports as to—Obtaining Engineer's Report, *June 6*, 804.
    - Mill Stream, Wreck of Board of Works Boat in, arranging for Removal of, *June 6*, 803.
  - Income Tax—Increase in salaries of officials, proposed, *June 13*, 1474.
  - Public Buildings, Insurance against fire, *June 13*, 1501.
- Land Tax Commissioners Name Bill—Date of Introduction, *May 31*, 486.
- Meteorological Council, Grant to—Tabling Report on Expenditure, proposed, *June 9*, 1225.
- Sugar—Certificates of origin and bonding of Sugar—Working of Convention Act, *May 31*, 466.
- Tea, Custom House inspection of—Quantity and quality of tea dealt with, *May 31*, 466.

Cecil, Mr. E. [Aston Manor]
- Eastern Mail Service—Committee Recommendations, *May 17*, 35.

Cecil, Lord H. R. H. [Greenwich]
- Fiscal Policy—Taxation of Food, Attitude of the Government towards, *May 18*, 265, 267, 278.
- Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *June 6*, 881.
- Thames River Steamboat Service Bill, *Con.*, *June 2*, 700.

Ceylon
- Public Works carried out by Government with material obtained exclusively through Crown Agents—Expenditure involved, etc.
  - *O.* Earl of Portsmouth, *June 10*, 1329–1331.

Chairman [Mr. J. W. Lowther]
- Absence of, *June 9*, 1201.
- Deputy—Foreign Office Vote, Items not to be discussed on, *June 9*, 1295, 1296, 1318.

[*cont.*

Chairman, Mr. J. W.—*cont.*
- Divisions.
  - Frivolous Challenge of—Members requested to rise in their places.
    - Claiming irrespective of numbers, precedent for, *June 2*, 708–710.
    - Position of Members in the lobbies expecting a division, *June 2*, 705–710.
  - Names of Members ticked off as having taken part in a division when no division taken, *June 2*, 709.
- Irrelevant Matter, Introduction of, *May 31*, 443, 464, 471 ; *June 8*, 1138, 1141, 1143, 1144, 1149, 1158, 1179.
- Licensing Bill.
  - Closure, Motion for—Member desiring to speak after acceptance of, 1024.
  - Compensation Fund to become a private Fund after 31 December, 1904, Amendment—Possibility of discussing apart from time limit, *June 6*, 900.
  - Discussion of whole subject on a particular Amendment, *June 6*, 859 ; *June 7*, 982.
  - Position and time of taking Amendments, *June 8*, 1173.
  - Postponement of Clause 1 proposed—Discussion of Clause in detail not permissible, *June 6*, 812.
  - Time limit Amendment.
    - Application of, to Clauses 1 and 2, *June 6*, 824–829.
    - Bill converted into a temporary Act by—Amendment contrary to standing Orders, alleged, *June 7*, 1030.
  - Motion to reduce Item of a Vote precluding Minister in charge from answering any questions, *June 2*, 678.

Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. [Birmingham W.]
- Aliens Bill—Motion to commit to Standing Committee on Law, *June 8*, 1111.
- Fiscal Policy, Changes in, Government attitude towards, etc., *May 18*, 266, 278–282.

Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. A.—*Chancellor of the Exchequer* [Worcestershire, E].
- Banks.
  - Bank of Ireland—Balances under Land Purchase Act of 1903, Arrangements as to Interest, *June 1*, 496–497.
  - Joint Stock Irish, Dissatisfaction of, with Arrangements as to Land Purchase Act — Allowing Opportunity for Discussion, *June 7*, 931–932.

Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. A.—*cont.*
  - Provincial Bank of Ireland, Government Moneys passing through, Weekly Balances held, etc.—Approximating Irish to Scotch System, *June 8*, 1051–1052.
- Customs duties.
  - Ireland, incidence in—Appointment of Committee of Inquiry, *May 18*, 248.
- Expenditure, increase in, and growth of taxation, *May 17*, 89–102.
- Finance Bill, 2R., *May 17*, 88 ; *May 18*, 231, 248.
- Friendly Societies, Unregistered, Position of—Payment of Income Tax by, etc., *May 31*, 476, 477, 479.
- Government Stock—Unclaimed Dividends, Annual Alphabetical List of Dividends, suggested Publication of, *May 18*, 179.
- Income Tax.
  - Abatements—House Property, allowing on Cost of Repairs to, *June 7*, 927.
  - Consol Certificates—Claims for Refundment of Past Years' Tax—Obliging Bank of England to Supply Certificates of Deduction of Tax on Proof of Ownership, *June 7*, 921.
  - Schoolmasters' Emoluments, Assessments under Schedule E. on—Securing Uniformity in Payments, *June 1*, 497.
- Liquor Licensing, etc.
  - Beer, Home-made, Licence required for brewing—Regulations as to Employment of Assistance, *June 8*, 1052–1053.
  - Dublin Victuallers' Association, Protest against Assessment levied on Members of—Making Inquiries, *June 8*, 1077.
- Local Government Board, Duties of—Committee Report, Date of tabling, *June 6*, 798.
- Navy.
  - Expenditure on, increase in—Abandonment of Two-Power standard, alleged, *May 17*, 95–97.
  - Foreign Navies—Expenditure, normal annual, of France, Germany, and Russia in each of past twenty-five years, *June 1*, 497.
- Public Works Loans—Extending Time of Repayment, *May 19*, 355.
- Taxation—Ireland, over-taxation of, alleged, *May 18*, 231–240.
- Tea Duty—Operations in bond and regulations as to bulking parcels together, *June 13*, 1474.
- Trade, Board of, Duties of—Committee Report, Date of tabling, *June 6*, 798.
- Transvaal War Contribution—Arrangements as to payment of, *June 13*, 1491.

Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster—*Rt. Hon. Sir W. H. Walrond.*

Chancellor of the Exchequer—*Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*

Channing, Mr. F. A. [Northamptonshire, E.]
Prevention of Corruption Bill, Date of Second Reading of, *June 7*, 922.

Chaplin, Rt. Hon. H. [Lincolnshire, Sleaford]
Finance Bill, 2R., *May 17*, 70.
Financial Position of the Country, *May 17*, 70–76.
Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *June 6*, 829, 839.

Chapman, Mr. E. [Cheshire, Hyde]
War Office Reconstitution Committee, Date of discussing Report of, *June 8*, 1079.

Charities
Durham, Administrative County of—Inquiry.
Return presented, *June 8*, 1045.
Whitstable, Draft Scheme for—Proposed Diverting of Teachers' Salaries for building National School — Withholding Sanction from Scheme.
Q. Mr. Slack; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *June 2*, 619.

Chesterfield Corporation [Tramways and Improvements] Bill
c. Con. May 18*, 157.
3R.* *June 1*, 489.
l. Commons' Amendts. *Con.* June 7*, 907.

Chesterfield Gas & Water Board Bill
c. Rep.* *June 2*, 615.
Con. June 8*, 1041.
3R.* *June 13*, 1461.

Chief Secretary for Ireland
Mr. G. Wyndham.

Children
Employment of—Sanctioning of By-laws under the Act — Local Authorities prohibiting Street Trading by Girls under Sixteen.
Q. Mr. Tennant; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *June 6*, 796.
Poor Law, *see under* Poor Law.
Vagrant, *see under* Vagrancy.

China
Commercial Treaty with Great Britain—Scope of, date of coming into force, etc.
Os. Mr. J. Walton, *May 19*, 392; Earl Percy, 411.
Mongolia, Journey in—Report by Mr. G. J. Kidston, presented, *May 18*, 159; *May 19*, 308.
Newchwang, Evacuation of, by Russians—Steps taken to safeguard Lives and Property of British Subjects.
Os. Mr. J. Walton, *May 19*, 390, 391; Earl Percy, 410.

China—*cont.*
Railway Concessions — Steps taken to secure share of, to British Companies.
Os. Mr. J. Walton, *May 19*, 391; Earl Percy, 410.
Trade Reports presented, *June 7*, 907, 908, 910.

Chippenham Gas Bill
l. 3R.* *May 17*, 2.
c. Lords' Amendments, *Con.* June 2*, 614.

Chitral
Administration, Cost of, etc.
Q. Mr. Schwann; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 9*, 1221.

Churchill, Mr. W. L. S. [Oldham]
Aliens Bill—Motion to commit to Standing Committee on Law, *June 8*, 1108.
Finance Bill, 2R., *May 18*, 227.
Ireland, Cost of Administration of, *May 18*, 227, 228.
Law Officers in Ireland, high salaries paid to, *May 18*, 227, 228.
Transvaal, Importation of Chinese Labour to, Expenses of, to be defrayed by Transvaal Government, *May 19*, 393, 394.

Civil Service
Clerks.
Abstractor Class.
Senior Assistants—Promotions to Second Division under Clause 15 of Order in Council, Nov. 29, 1898.
Q. Mr. Yoxall; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *June 6*, 778–779.
War Office, Number over Age of Fifty gazetted to, etc.
Q. Sir T. Esmonde; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *June 1*, 495–496.
New Class Assistant, replying to Memorials from.
Q. Mr. E. Gray; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *May 19*, 349.
Second Division.
Promotions of Senior Assistants to Rank of, under Clause 15 of Order in Council, Nov. 29th, 1898.
Q. Mr. Yoxall; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *June 6*, 778–779.
Temporary and Permanent Employment of, Statistics as to.
Q. Mr. Crooks; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *May 19*, 347-348.
Superannuation.
Appointment without Certificate, *May 31*, 424; *June 8*, 1045; *June 9*, 1184; *June 10*, 1327.

[*cont.*

Civil Service—*cont.*
Superannuation—*cont.*
Certificate granted through Inadvertence, *May 18*, 159; *May 19*, 309.
Retired Allowance granted, *June 7*, 918; *June 9*, 1184.

Civil Service Estimates
Board of Trade, Salaries and Expenses—£146,461, *Com.*, *June 2*, 710.
Customs Department, Salaries and Expenses—£569,000, *Com.*, *May 31*, 437.
Foreign Office, Salaries and Expenses—£35,771, *Com.*, *June 9*, 1235.
Increase in.
O. Sir H. Fowler, *May 17*, 81.
Inland Revenue Department Salaries and Expenses—£1,355,100, *Com.*, *May 31*, 473.
Local Government Board Salaries and Expenses—£142,089, *Com.*, *June 2*, 632.
Public Buildings—£435,300, *Com.*, *May 31*, 488.

Clancy, Mr. J. J. [Dublin Co., N.]
Finance Bill, 2R., *May 18*, 186.
Labourers' Cottages, Ireland — Loans, Onerous Nature of Terms for, alleged, *June 9*, 1212.
Taxation of Ireland, Commercial Prospects ruined by, *May 18*, 186–204.

Clerkenwell County Court
Perjury in, Taking Steps to suppress.
Q. Mr. B. Roberts; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *May 19*, 359.

Cliffe, Kent
Explosion at Works of Messrs. Curtis & Harvey.
Report presented, *June 6*, 776; *June 7*, 910.

Clonbrock, Lord
Land Act, Working of—Agitation and Intimidation by the United Irish League, etc., *May 19*, 334–335; *June 13*, 1419–1424.

Clones
Post Office—Arrangements in New Building.
Q. Mr. McKean; *A.* Lord Stanley, *June 9*, 1207.

Clyde Navigation (Works) Bill
c. Rep.* *June 13*, 1462.

Clyde Valley Electrical Power Bill
c. 2R.* *May 17*, 23.

Coal Mines
Explosives, Tests for.
Qs. Mr. Markham; *As.* Mr. A. Douglas, *June 9*, 1223, 1224.

Coastguard Service
Ireland—Arryheera, Donegal, Cause of Delay in Erection of Station at.
Q. Mr. O'Doherty; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *June* 6, 777–778.

Coasting Trade
See under Merchant Shipping.

Cochin China
Trade Report presented, *June 10*, 1326.

Cochrane, Mr. T. H.—*Under Secretary, Home Office* [Ayrshire, N.]
London County Council (Tramways and Improvements) Bill, *Con.*, *June 9*, 1300.
Musical Copyright Bill, *Con.*, *June 10*, 1391.
Penal Servitude Bill, 2R., *June 3*, 755.
Shop Hours Bill, 2R., *June 1*, 591.

Coghill, Mr. D. H. [Stoke-upon-Trent]
Kensington Gardens, Stoppage of Fountains in—Reason, *May 17*, 34.

Cohen, Mr. B. L. [Islington, E.]
Customs Department Staff—Dismissal of staff engaged to levy the Corn tax, proposed, *May 31*, 442.
Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *June 7*, 983.

Coinage and Currency
New Silver Coinage, Place of Minting.
Q. Mr. Bayley; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *June 9*, 1205.

Collings, Rt. Hon. J. [Birmingham, Bordesley]
Enfield Small Arms Factory, Cost of producing Rifles at, *June 8*, 1059.

Colney Hatch Gas Bill
l. Rep.* *May 17*, 1.
3R.* *June 7*, 906.
c. Lords' Amendts. *Con.** *June 13*, 1461.

Colomb, Sir J. C. R. [Great Yarmouth]
Army.
Nursing—Wives and Families of Soldiers in Places unprovided with Hospitals, suggestions as to providing for, *June 6*, 786.
Recruiting — Effect of Three Years System—Percentage of Extensions required for Service abroad, *May 18*, 160.

Colonial Office
Secretary of State — Rt. Hon. Alfred Lyttelton.
Parliamentary Secretary—Duke of Marlborough.

Colonies
For particular Colonies, see their names.
Crown Agents for the, *see that title.*
[*cont.*

Colonies—*cont.*
Magazine Postage Rates to and from, Proposed Reduction of, Estimated loss of Revenue by.
Q. Sir G. Parker; *A.* Lord Stanley, *June 8*, 1069–1070.
Mines and Quarries—General Report and Statistics presented, *May 17*, 4, 28.
Reports, Annual, presented, *May 31*, 423; *June 2*, 618; *June 7*, 908.

Columbia, British
Provincial Immigration Act, 1904, Protest from Japan as to, etc.
Q. Mr. C. Devlin; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *June 8*, 1061.

Commerce
See Trade and Commerce.

Committee of Defence
See Defence of the Empire.

Committees
House of Commons.
Chairman, *see that title.*
Privileges — Nomination of Members proposed.
Q. Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 13*, 1502, 1503.
Public Accounts — Report presented, *June 10*, 1365.
Public Petitions — Report presented, *May 18*, 185.

Commons Regulation (Merrow) Provisional Order Bill
c. Rep.* *June 2*, 615.
3R.* *June 3*, 713.
l. 1R.* *June 7*, 906.

Commons Regulation (Oxshott) Provisional Order Bill
c. Rep.* *June 2*, 614.
3R.* *June 3*. 713.
l. 1R.* *June 7*, 906.

Compton, Lord A. F. [Bedfordshire, Biggleswade]
Expenditure of the Country, increase in, *May 17*, 57.
Finance Bill, 2R., *May 17*, 57.

Compulsory Service
Ballot Act for the Militia, Suggested Revival of, as an Alternative to.
Q. Sir F. Banbury; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *June* 8, 1057–1058.
Recommendations of Norfolk Commission of Inquiry, Government Attitude towards.
Qs. Mr. H. Samuel, Mr. C. R. Spencer; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *June 2*, 620–621.
Q. Sir H. Vincent; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 6*, 804–805.

Conciliation and Arbitration Boards
Report (1903) Presented, *May 31*, 426; *June 7*, 910.

Congested Districts Board, Ireland
Cooscroum Landing Stage, Improvement made to, Inadequacy of—Providing Proper Facilities.
O. Mr. Boland, *May 19*, 401.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 19*, 364–365.
Estates Purchased by, During six months ended 30 April, 1904.
Return Ordered, *June 9*, 1205.
Fitzgerald Estate, County Mayo, Securing Grazing Farms on, for Congested Areas.
Q. Dr. Ambrose; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 18*, 170; *June 7*, 921–922.
Kerry, North.
Congested Electoral Divisions, Number of—Expenditure on Fisheries, 1897 to 1903, etc.
Q. Mr. Flavin; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 17*, 44.
Fisheries of—Applications from Beale and Gullane for Improved Facilities—Action of the Board.
Q. Mr. Flavin; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 19*, 366.
Loans from, in Aid of Irish Industries—Nature of Security.
Q. Mr. Brigg; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 3*, 719–720.
Longworth Estate, Galway, Purchase of—Enlarging Adjoining Holdings.
Q. Mr. Roche; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 17*, 31–32.

Congo
Free State, Administration of, by the Belgian Government.
Os. Mr. A. Taylor, *June 9*, 1247–1250; Mr. Emmott, 1255; Sir J. Gorst, 1259; Mr. H. Samuel, 1261; Earl Percy, 1272, 1275–1277; Sir E. Grey, 1285; Mr. J. Campbell, 1324.
Burrows Libel Case.
O. Mr. H. Samuel, *June 9*, 1261.
Cannibal Soldiery, Employment of, alleged.
Os. Sir C. Dilke, *June 9*, 1240; Mr. H. Samuel, 1265.
Concessionaire Régime — Breach of Treaty Conditions, alleged.
Os. Sir C. Dilke, *June 9*, 1237, 1246; Mr. A. Taylor, 1248; Mr. H. Samuel, 1265.
Consular Courts for Protection of British Residents, establishing.
Os. Mr. Emmott, *June 9*, 1256, 1257; Sir J. Gorst, 1260 Mr. H. Samuel, 1267; Lord E. Fitzmaurice, 1270; Sir E. Grey, 1288, 1289.
Q. Mr. Jacoby; *A.* Earl Percy, *May 19*, 350.

Congo—*cont.*
Free State, etc.—*cont.*
Depopulation due to.
Os. Sir C. Dilke, *June 9*, 1238-1240, 1244.
Domaine privé and *Domaine de la Couronne,* Atrocities Committed in.
Os. Sir C. Dilke, *June 9*, 1241, 1242 ; Mr. Emmott, 1254.
European Conference and Intervention of America, proposed.
Os. Sir C. Dilke, *June 9*, 1247 ; Mr. Emmott, 1256 ; Sir J. Gorst, 1259, 1260 ; Lord Percy, 1281.
Extra-Territorial Jurisdiction of Great Britain, Exercise of, proposed.
Os. Earl Percy, *June 9*, 1279, 1280.
International Navigation Commission —Entrusting Settlement of the Question to, proposed.
Os. Lord E. Fitzmaurice, *June 9*, 1271 ; Earl Percy, 1279.
International Rights of Europe against the Free State, Enforcement of.
Os. Lord E. Fitzmaurice, *June 9*, 1268-1270 ; Earl Percy, 1284 ; Sir E. Grey, 1286, 1288.
Jones, Silvanus, Case of—Inadequate Means of Defence—Tabling Report of Trial, etc.
Os. Mr. Emmott, *June 9*, 1257 ; Earl Percy, 1276, 1280.
Q. Mr. C. Wason ; *A.* Earl Percy, *May 18*, 178.
Legal Points—Referring to the Hague Tribunal, proposed.
Os. Mr. Emmott, *June 9*, 1256 ; Mr. H. Samuel, 1265, 1266 ; Earl Percy, 1283.
Measures taken by the Belgian Government to suppress atrocities, etc.
Os. Earl Percy, *June 2*, 1282-1284 ; Sir E. Grey, 1286.
Natives in, Treatment of—Allegations of Cruelty.
Os. Sir C. Dilke, *June 9*, 1236-1247 ; Mr. Emmott, 1254, 1255 ; Mr. H. Samuel, 1262, 1264.
Caudron Case.
Os. Sir C. Dilke, *June 9*, 1245 ; Mr. Emmott, 1254 ; Mr. H. Samuel, 1563.
Commission Instituted for protection of Natives, Work of.
Os. Sir C. Dilke, *June 9*, 1237 ; Earl Percy, 1278.
Despatches relating to.
Presented, *June 8*, 1045 ; *June 9*, 1184.
Terms of.
Os. Sir C. Dilke, *June 9*, 1237-1244 ; Mr. A. Taylor, 1250 ; Mr. Emmott, 1252, 1253, 1254 ; Mr. H. Samuel, 1262, 1263.

Congo—*cont.*
Free State, etc.—*cont.*
Responsibility and Policy of the British Government — Protests made by, etc.
Os. Sir C. Dilke, *June 9*, 1246, 1247 ; Mr. A. Taylor, 1250, 1251 ; Mr. Emmott, 1251-1253 ; Sir J. Gorst, 1258-1260 ; Mr. H. Samuel, 1267 ; Earl Percy, 1272, 1273, 1275, 1279 ; Sir E. Grey, 1287 ; Mr. L. Sinclair, 1318.
Stokes, Mr., Murder of.
Os. Mr. Emmott, *June 9*, 1254 ; Lord E. Fitzmaurice, 1369, 1270 ; Sir E. Grey, 1289.
Trade, Falling off in—Liberty of International Trade Violated, etc.
Os. Sir C. Dilke, *June 9*, 1246 ; Mr. Emmott, 1251 ; Mr. H. Samuel, 1265 ; Earl Percy, 1274.
French—Concessions Régime, Omission to settle Dispute as to.
Os. Sir C. Dilke, *June 1*, 542, 543 ; Mr. Emmott, 576, 577.

Consol Certificates
Income Tax, Claims for Refundment of Past Years'—Obliging Bank of England to supply Certificates of Deduction of Tax on Proof of Ownership.
Q. Mr. H. Samuel ; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *June 7*, 921.

Constabulary, Royal Irish
Anderson, Constable, Dismissal of—Reasons for reconsideration of case.
Qs. Mr. Dillon, Mr. Sloan, Mr. Lundon, Mr. MacVeagh ; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 13*, 1497-1501.
Cadets Hodge and Richardson—Absence on Leave—Pay and Allowances.
Q. Mr. Delany ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 17*, 46.
Cork, Statutory Strength in, 1892 and 1893—Strength maintained.
Q. Mr. Flynn ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 19*, 344-345.
Cost of, References to, in Debate on the Finance Bill, *May 18*, 205, 214.
Dublin Cycle-stealing Case—Number of Cycles purchased from Ferns by Constabulary, etc.
Q. Mr. Mooney ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 13*, 1495, 1496.
Photography—Snap-shots, New Instructions as to obtaining Information by means of, etc.
Q. Mr. Cullinan ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 6*, 785.
Reduction in Men and Officers 1884 to 1904.
Q. Mr. Delany ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 17*, 46.

[*cont.*

Consumption

Sanatoria for, Growth of, Danger of, and inability of Local Authorities to cope with.
Os. Sir E. Sassoon, *May 19*, 386; Mr. W. Long, 389.

Contraband of War

Cotton as, Declaration by the Russian Government—Information as to.
O. Marquess of Lansdowne, *May 19*, 309.
Q. Lord Avebury; *A.* Marquess of Lansdowne, *May 17*, 11, 12.
Q. Mr. L. Walton; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 6*, 804.

Convict Prisons

Rules—Draft of new rules presented, *June 7*, 912, 918.

Coolrain

Telegraph Connection with Mountrath, Delay in completing.
Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 18*, 164-165.

Cooscroum

Landing Stage—Inadequacy of Improvement made by Congested Districts Board—Providing Proper Facilities.
O. Mr. Boland, *May 19*, 401.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 19*, 364-365.

Corbett, Mr. A. C. [Glasgow, Tradeston]

Education [Scotland] Bill, *Com.*, *June 13*, 1575.

Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *June 7*, 964; *June 8*, 1176.

Shop Hours Bill, 2R., *June 1*, 601.

Cork

Agriculture and Technical Instruction, Minutes presented, *June 6*, 775; *June 7*, 912.

Constabulary in, 1892 and 1893—Statutory Strength and Strength maintained.
Q. Mr. Flynn; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 19*, 344-345.

Post Office Examinations—Restrictions as to Candidates.
Q. Mr. J. O'Connor; *A.* Lord Stanley, *June 13*, 1470, 1471.

Corn Duty

Re-imposition of, Proposed—References to, in debate on the Finance Bill, *May 17*, 75, 76, 132.

Staff engaged to levy, *see under* Customs Department—Staff.

Cornahilla

School Teacher, Promotion of.
Q. Mr. Jordan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 13*, 1492.

Cornwall

Harbour of Refuge, Construction of, proposed.
Memorandum presented, *May 18*, 159, *May 19*, 309.
Names of Local Authorities making Representations as to.
Q. Mr Soares; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *June 8*, 1070-1071.

Mines and Quarries—Health of Miners—Report presented, *May 31*, 423; *June 7*, 908.

Cotton

Contraband of War, declaration by the Russian Government—Information as to, etc.
O. Marquess of Lansdowne, *May 19*, 309.
Q. Lord Avebury; *A.* Marquess of Lansdowne, *May 17*, 11, 12.
Q. Mr. L. Walton; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 6*, 804.

Corners in.
American Preventive Measures, Obtaining and Tabling Information as to.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *May 19*, 345.
International Co-operation to prevent, Governmental Action as to—Zurich Congress.
Qs. Mr. Field, Mr. Markham; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 7*, 932-933.

India.
Natural Fertilisers, existence of, in proximity to land suitable for Cotton growing.
Q. Mr. Emmott, *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 3*, 718.
Return.
Ordered, *June 7*, 918.
Presented, *June 9*, 1204.

County Councils

Buckingham—Refusal to give Details as to Rate levied—Enforcing Information.
Os. Mr. Alfred Davies, *June 2*, 674; Mr. W. Long, 678.
Q. Mr. Alfred Davies; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *May 19*, 361.

Medical Officers of Health, number employed in counties, terms of appointment, etc.
Return Ordered, *May 18*, 160.

Motor Car Regulations — Ascertaining County Council opinion, proposed.
Q. Mr. Gardner; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *June 9*, 1225.

County Courts

Ireland—Registrars, Salaries of, etc.
Return presented, *May 31*, 426.

Perjury in, Taking Steps to Suppress.
Q. Mr. B. Roberts; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *May 19*, 359.

County Courts (Admiralty Jurisdiction) Bill

c. 1R.* *June 6*, 808.

Craig, Mr. C. C. [Antrim, S.]

McDonnell, Sir A. P., Pay and Services of, during 1903–4, *June 10*, 1370.

Craig, Mr. R. H. [Lanarkshire, Govan]

Lunacy due to Intemperance, Granting Return showing Statistics as to, *June 8*, 1064–1065.

Cremer, Mr. W. R. [Shoreditch, Haggerston]

London County Council (Tramways and Improvements) Bill, *Con.*, *June 9*, 1313.

Crete

Situation in—Question of Indemnities, etc. *Os.* Mr. Bryce, *June 9*, 1316; Earl Percy, 1320.

Crimean War

Pensions, Increase of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *June 9*, 1215.

Criminals, Habitual

[*See also under* Penal Servitude Bill.]

Treatment of — Tabling Communications between Home Office and H.M. Judges, Proposed.
Q. Mr. Dalziel; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *June 9*, 1224.

Cripps, Mr. C. A. [Lancashire, Stretford]

Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *June 6*, 862; *June 8*, 1175.

Crombie, Mr. J. W. [Kincardineshire]

Education [Scotland] Bill, *Com.*, *June 13*, 1522, 1544.

Railway Rates.

Fish, for—Extending Scope of Inquiry of Committee on Rates for Agricultural Produce, *May 17*, 41.

General Merchandise, For—Appointing Departmental Committee of Inquiry, *May 17*, 39.

Crooks, Mr. W. [Woolwich]

Enfield Small Arms Factory—Value of Plant and Material standing idle, on which Rates are paid, *June 8*, 1059.

Bryant and May, Death of Employee of, from Phossy Jaw, *June 8*, 1065.

Civil Service Clerks, Second Division, Statistics as to Temporary and Permanent Employment of, *May 19*, 347.

Penal Servitude Bill, 2R., *June 3*, 765.

Poor Law Children.

Elementary and Secondary Schools, Education in, *June 2*, 648.

Imbeciles, improved system of instruction for, *June 2*, 651.

Crooks, Mr. W.—*cont.*

Poor Law Children—*cont.*

Scattered Homes and Boarding-out Systems, working of, *June 2*, 649, 650.

Workhouses, objections to retention in, *June 2*, 651, 652.

Poor Law Officers, Gratuities to—Contributions from West End parishes, proposed, *June 2*, 652.

Public Works Loans—Extending Time of Repayment, *May 19*, 355.

Transvaal.

Chinese Labour, Introduction of—Banking Arrangements for Labourers, *May 18*, 176.

Native Labour in Mines—Wages of Convicts, *May 18*, 177.

Vagrant Children, Control of—Necessity for legislation, *June 2*, 648.

Cross, Mr. A. [Glasgow, Camlachie]

Education [Scotland] Bill, *Com.*, *June 13*, 1557.

Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *June 7*, 1012.

Musical Copyright Bill, *Con.*, *June 10*, 1398.

Crown Agents for the Colonies

Debate (Lords), *June 10*, 1328.

Advantages of System in Crown Colonies, 1347.

British Honduras—Railway—Obstructive attitude of Crown Agents, 1328, 1329.

Ceylon Public Works material — Objections as to, 1329–1331.

Commissions paid to, rate of, 1336 1338, 1348, 1362.

Delays in carrying out orders, reasons for, 1351.

Departmental construction by, costliness of, 1339, 1340.

Expenses falling on the Imperial Exchequer, 1336, 1339.

Freight contracts, tactics of Conference Lines, etc., 1335, 1340–1345, 1362, 1363.

Gold Coast Railway.

Price paid to Crown Agents for construction of—Nature of the work, etc., 1331, 1332, 1352.

Rates charged on, compared with those on other African Railways, 1332.

Inquiry, results of, 1350, 1351, 1363.

List of Articles for which tenders have been invited, and names of firms supplying, 1348.

Nyassa, Lake, Steamer for—Difference in prices quoted by private firm and Crown Agents, 1353, 1344.

[*cont.*

Crown Agents for the Colonies—*cont.*
Debate (Lords), *June 10*, 1328.
Personnel of the Crown Agents Office and the Colonial Office, 1333, 1350, 1357, 1361.
Purchases from Steamship Owners instead of direct from Suppliers, objections to system, 1334, 1335.
Remuneration and functions of, 1347–1349.
Inquiry proposed, 1328, 1337, 1338, 1341, 1356–1359, 1361.
Trade and Cash Discounts, question of, 1337.
Transvaal—Compulsory purchase of all stores and materials through Crown Agents, 1355, 1360.
Johannesburg Chamber of Commerce Resolutions of protest, 1333, 1334.
Audited Accounts 1900 to 1902, tabling.
Q. Sir H. Fowler ; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 18*, 174.
Malta, Value of Stores supplied to, and Commission charged each year 1899–1903, etc.
Q. Mr. Boland ; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 31*, 432.
Railway, etc., Plant supplied by—Number of firms invited to tender.
Return.
Ordered, *May 17*, 31.
Presented, *June 6*, 776.

Croydon Gas Bill
c. Lords' Amendts. *Con.** *May 31*, 421.

Crystal Palace District Gas Bill
l. 2R.* *May 19*, 306.

Cullinan, Mr. J. [Tipperary, S.]
Constabulary — Photography — New Instructions as to taking Snap-shots, etc., *June 6*, 785.
Division—Omission of name, *June 3*, 721.
Evictions, Statistics as to Applications for, and Reinstatements made, *June 6*, 785–786.
Licences, depriving Magistrates of Commission for Signing, outside their District, *June 6*, 802.
Tipperary—Telephone Connection with Clonmell, including Cahir in, *June 6*, 781.

Cummertrees
School—New Building in place of addition to old—Sanctioning Expenditure.
Q. Mr. Maxwell ; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *June 8*, 1075–1076.

Cust, Mr. H. J. C. [Southwark, Bermondsey]
Expenditure, increase in, and causes of, *May 17*, 121–127.
Finance Bill, 2R., *May 17*, 121.

Customs and Excise
Belgian Tariff—Report presented, *June 10*, 1327.
Boatmen.
Appointment of—Objections to system of.
Os. Mr. J. H. Lewis, *May 31*, 447 ; Mr. G. Bowles, 449 ; Mr. C. Warner, 450 ; Major E. Gordon, 451 ; Mr. M. Ferguson, 455 ; Sir A. Acland-Hood, 457.
Duties of—Scale of pay and chances of promotion, etc.
Os. Major E. Gordon, *May 31*, 450–455 ; Sir A. Acland-Hood, 457 ; Mr. V. Cavendish, 459.
Misnomer—Granting title of Waterguard Officers, proposed.
O. Major E. Gordon, *May 31*, 451, 452.
Sunday duty, Granting extra pay for, proposed.
Os. Major E. Gordon, *May 31*, 454, 460 ; Mr. M. Ferguson, 455.
Ireland, Incidence in — Appointment of Committee of Inquiry.
Os. Sir T. Esmonde, Mr. A. Chamberlain, *May 18*, 248.
Luggage, Inspection of.
Dover, Newhaven, and Londonderry, Inconvenient arrangements at.
Os. Mr. C. Hay, *May 31*, 439 ; Mr. V. Cavendish, 442 ; Mr. J. F. Hope, 443 ; Mr. Maconochie, 444 ; Mr. C. Devlin, 445.
London and Paris, Establishment of Offices in, for examination prior to despatching to the Continent, proposed.
Os. Mr. L. Sinclair, *May 31*, 465 ; Mr. V. Cavendish, 466.
Port, and Star Allowances—Information as to.
Os. Mr. Whitley, *May 31*, 463, 469, 470 ; Mr. V. Cavendish, 467–470 ; Mr. Dalziel, 467 ; Mr. G. Bowles, 468 ; Mr. Lough, 469 ; Sir E. Grey, 470.
Preventive Officers.
Pay, Improvement in, proposed.
Os. Mr. W. Rutherford, *May 31*, 456 ; Mr. C. Wason, 456 ; Mr. V. Cavendish, 459.
Sunday duty, Granting extra pay for, proposed.
Os. Mr. W. Rutherford, *May 31*; 456 ; Mr. C. Wason, 456 ; Mr. V. Cavendish, 459.
Smugglers, Capture of — Amount of Estimate for, etc.
Os. Mr. Whitley, *May 31*, 467, 470 ; Mr. V. Cavendish, 470, 471 ; Mr. Caldwell, 470 ; Mr. Weir, Mr. G. Bowles, Lord E. Fitzmaurice, 471 ; Mr. Dalziel, 472.

[*cont.*

Customs and Excise—*cont.*

Staff.

Appointment by nomination, Objections to.
O. Mr. J. F. Hope, *May 31*, 443.

Dismissal of Staff engaged to levy Corn Tax, proposed.
Os. Mr. Whitley, *May 31*, 437, 438; Sir E. Durning-Lawrence, 439; Mr. E. Gray, 440, 441; Mr. V. Cavendish, 441; Mr. Cohen, 442; Mr. J. F. Hope, 443.

Increase in, reasons for, and objections to.
Os. Mr. Whitley, *May 31*, 438, 445; Mr. G. Bowles, 446.

Sugar—Certificates of origin, and bonding of sugar—Information as to working of Act.
Os. Mr. Lough, *May 31*, 465; Mr. V. Cavendish, 466.

Tea, Inspection of—Quantity and quality of tea dealt with—Remuneration and duties of Inspectors.
Os. Mr. Lough, *May 31*, 463, 464; Mr. V. Cavendish, 466.

"Vigilant"—Abolition of rum ration to Sailors, proposed.
O. Mr. Weir, *May 31*, 473.

Watchers.

Pay, Uniform and leave grievances.
Os. Capt. Norton, *May 31*, 457–459, 460; Mr. Causton, 459; Mr. V. Cavendish, 460.

Cyprus

Archbishopric, Vacant, of, Steps taken as to—Result of Intervention of High Commissioner.
Q. Mr. Yoxall; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *June 1*, 497–498.

Dalkeith, Earl of [Roxburgh]

Education [Scotland] Bill, *Com.*, *June 13*, 1533.

Dalziel, Mr. J. H. [Kirkcaldy Burghs]

Aliens Bill.

Expenses—Resolution as to, *June 8*, 1150.

Motion to Commit to Standing Committee on Law, *June 8*, 1117.

Criminals, Habitual, Treatment of—Tabling Communications between Home Office and H. M. Judges, proposed, *June 9*, 1224.

Customs Department.

Port and Star Allowances, Information as to, *May 31*, 467.

Smugglers, Capture of—Amount of Estimate for, etc., *May 31*, 472.

Fiscal Policy—Amendment by the Prime Minister to Motion by Mr. Black—Terms of, *May 17*, 155, 156.

Dalziel, Mr. J. H.—*cont.*

Division challenged frivolously—Members requested to rise in their places—Position of Members already in the Lobbies, *June 2*, 707.

Education [Scotland] Bill, *Com.*, *June 13*, 1541, 1547, 1557, 1573.

Meteorological Council, Grant to—Tabling Report on Expenditure, proposed, *June 9*, 1225.

Musical Copyright Bill, *Con.*, *June 10*, 1382, 1411.

Penal Servitude Bill, 2R., *June 3*, 757.

Shop Hours Bill, 2R., *June 1*, 607.

Davenport, Mr. W. B.—*Financial Secretary to the War Office* [Cheshire, Macclesfield]

Dublin — Prohibition of Soldiers from walking in Main Streets, alleged, *June 13*, 1482.

Enfield Small Arms Factory.

Discharged Workmen, Delay in payment of gratuities to, *June 13*, 1479.

Slackness of Work, Distress due to—Giving larger proportion of Work to Enfield than to Private Contractors, etc., *June 8*, 1058, 1059.

Indian Army, Drafts for—Number of Men sent with less than one year of unexpired Service, cost of Transport, per head, etc., *June 13*, 1481.

Rifles, new, Manufacture of — Number, Cost, etc., *June 13*, 1480.

Yeomanry, Imperial — Re-engagement period, alteration in, proposed, *June 13*, 1482.

Davies, Mr. A. [Carmarthen Boroughs]

Buckingham County Council Rate, Refusal to give Details as to — Enforcing Information *May 19*, 361; *June 2*, 674.

Education—Passive Resisters, number of, gravity of the question, etc., *May 19*, 414.

Liquor Licensing, etc.—Number of Licences refused and ground of refusal in 1901 and 1902, *June 9*, 1209.

Meat.

Frozen, Increase in Cancer due to, alleged, *June 2*, 675.

Price, average, and consumption per Head during last five years and five years previous to Repeal of Corn Laws, *May 18*, 166.

Rates—Liability of Officers to furnish particulars of, on demand, *June 2*, 674.

De Trafford Estate Bill

l. 2R.* *June 9*, 1182.

De Vesci, Viscount

Representative Peer for Ireland—Right to vote at elections established, *June 13*, 1417.

Dean Forest Bill
c 1R.* *May 17*, 48.
2R.* *June 7*, 1040.

Deaths
Ireland — Report of Registrar-General (1891-1900) presented, *May 31*, 424; *June 7*, 908.
Lists of, supplied by Registrars in Country Places to Weekly Newspapers—continuing practice.
Q. Sir W. Forster; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *June 8*, 1048-1049.
Q. Mr. Mansfield; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *June 8*, 1073.

Deer Forests, Scotland
Returns as to, Inaccuracy of.
O. Mr. Weir, *May 31*, 482.

Defence of the Empire
Colonial Contributions towards Expenditure.
Canadian Views on.
Q. Mr. C. Devlin; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *June 2*, 622.
Milner, Lord, views expressed by, sanction of Government to, etc.
Q. Mr. C. Delvin; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *June 2*, 622.
Committee of Defence.
Criticisms on work of, References to, in debate on the Finance Bill, *May 17*, 93, 147, 148.
Discussion on, putting down Supplementary Estimate to allow.
Q. Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 8*, 1079.
Home Defence, Force to be maintained for, Decision of Defence Committee as to.
Q. Mr. Lambert; *A.* Mr. Balfour, *June 6*, 805-806.

Delany, Mr. W. [Queen's County, Ossory]
Agricultural Department, Veterinary Branch—Petition from Roman Catholic Clerks, alleged Refusal of Chief Clerk to forward, *May 18*, 183.
Constabulary.
Cadets Hodge and Richardson — Absence on Leave — Pay and Allowances, *May 17*, 46.
Reduction in Men and Officers 1884 to 1904, *May 17*, 46.
Education — National School Teachers' Salaries, Inequality as to increases of, *May 17*, 36.
Telegraph Service—Mountrath and Coolrain, connection between, Delay in completing, *May 18*, 164-165.

Denbigh, Earl of
Land Act, Working of — Agitation and Intimidation by the United Irish League, etc., *May 19*, 335-337.

Denman, Lord
Yeomanry Establishment, changes in—Reduction in Strength of units, etc., *May 19*, 326, 327.

Denmark
Trade Report presented, *June 10*, 1326.

Denny, Col. J. M. [Kilmarnock Burghs]
Education (Scotland) Bill, *Com.*, *June 13*, 1528, 1577.

Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire Electric Power Bill
c. 2R.* *May 31*, 421.

Derrygonnelly
Insanitary Condition of, taking immediate Steps to remedy.
Q. Mr. E. Mitchell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 17*, 42.

Derwent Valley Water Board Bill
l. Report of Select Committee, *May 19*, 305.
3R.* *June 9*, 1182.
c. 1R.* *June 13*, 1463.

Devlin, Mr. C. R. [Galway]
Canada—Immigration Frauds, Government Action as to, *June 8*, 1064.
Columbia, British, Provincial Immigration Act 1904 of, Protest from Japan as to, etc., *June 8*, 1061.
Defence of the Empire, Colonial Contributions towards.
Canadian Views as to, *June 2*, 622.
Milner, Lord, Views expressed by, Sanction of Government to, etc., *June 2*, 622.
Galway.
Docks, Dredger for, and Lighting of, *June 2*, 627, 628.
Mill Stream, Wreck of Board of Works Boat in, arranging for Removal of, *June 6*, 803.
Shambles Barracks, condemned Buildings of, Steps to dispose of, *June 6*, 790.
Londonderry—Inspection of Luggage at—Inconvenience of Custom House arrangements, *May 31*, 445.

Devlin, Mr. J. [Kilkenny, N.]
Belfast Valuation Appeals, Delay in hearing, proposed, *June 13*, 1496, 1497.
Irish Temperance League, Refusal of, to admit Soldiers as members, alleged, *June 13*, 1482.

Devonport
Borough of—New Writ for Parliamentary Election issued, *June 9*, 1234.
Dockyard—Piecework System, Introduction of—Effect on Number of Men employed.
Q. Mr. Bell; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *June 13*, 1469.

Devonshire

Geological Survey of—New Survey proposed.
Q. Mr. Soares; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *June 13*, 1491, 1492.

Harbour of Refuge on North Coast of, Names of Local Authorities making Representations as to.
Q. Mr. Soares; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *June 8*, 1070–1071.

Dewar, Mr. J. A. [Inverness]

London County Council (Tramways and Improvements) Bill, *Con. June 9*, 1312.

Dhar, Dewan of

Estate, Inquiry as to Restoration of confiscated portion of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 9*, 1211, 1212.

Dickson, Rt. Hon. C. S.—*Lord Advocate* [Glasgow, Bridgeton]

Poor Law Medical Relief, Report of Departmental Committee on, *June 6*, 800, 801.

Dickson-Poynder, Sir J. [Wilts, Chippenham]

Indian Army, Drafts for—Number of men sent with less than one year of Unexpired Service—Cost of Transport per head, &c., *June 13*, 1481.

Yeomanry, Imperial — Re-engagement, Alteration in Period for, proposed, *June 13*, 1481.

Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir C. W. [Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean]

Anglo-French Convention Bill, 2R., *June 1*, 536–545, 571, 572.

Bryant and May, Death of Employee of, from Phossy Jaw, *June 8*, 1066.

Business of the House.
Congested State of, *May 19*, 384.
Course of, *May 31*, 436.

Congo Free State, Administration of, by the Belgian Government, Treatment of Natives, etc., *June 9*, 1236–1247.

Defence Committee, Putting down Supplementary Estimate to allow Discussion on, *June 8*, 1079.

Fiscal Policy, Changes in—Necessity for Discussion in the House, *May 19*, 385.

Parliamentary Procedure—New Rules, Working of, *May 19*, 383.

Shop Hours Bill, 2R., *June 1*, 577.

Transvaal Mines—Robinson Deep Mine, Accident at, *May 18*, 173.

Dillon, Mr. J. [Mayo, E.]

Constabulary, R.I.—Constable Anderson, Reasons for Re-consideration of Dismissal of, &c., *June 13*, 1497–1500.

Dingle

Railway to Tralee, Negotiations as to—Submitting Terms of Agreement to the House.
Qs. Mr. Field, Mr. Nannetti, Mr. Murphy; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 7*, 929–930.

Diplomatic and Consular Service

Reports as to Functions of Ministers in Foreign Countries, Insufficiency of.
O. Mr. L. Sinclair, *June 9*, 1318.

Dir

Administration, Cost of, &c.
Q. Mr. Schwann; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 9*, 1221.

Diseases of Animals

Tuberculosis.
Commission of Inquiry into—Interim Report presented, *May 31*, 424; *June 7*, 909.
Compensation—Committee of Inquiry, Nomination of, *June 8*, 1084.

Diseases of Animals Acts

Ireland—Report (1903), presented, *May 31*, 426; *June 7*, 909.

Divisions

Frivolous or vexatious challenge of—Members requested to rise in their places.
Claiming irrespective of numbers, Precedent for.
Os. Mr. P. O'Brien, *June 2*, 708; Mr. J. W. Lowther, 708, 710; Mr. Kearley, Mr. MacVeagh, 709.
Definition of a Member rising in his place.
Os. Mr. Whitley, *June 3*, 721; Mr. Speaker, 721, 722.
Position of Members already in the Lobbies.
Os. Mr. C. R. Spencer, *June 2*, 705; Mr. J. W. Lowther, 705, 706, 707; Mr. Bryce, Mr. E. Robertson, 706; Mr. Emmott, 706, 707; Mr. Caldwell, Mr. Whitley, Mr. Dalziel, 707.

Name of Member omitted, Subsequent insertion of.
Os. Mr. Cullinan, Mr. Speaker, *June 3*, 721; Mr. Markham, Mr. Speaker, *June 6*, 806.

Names of Members ticked off by clerks as having taken part in a Division when no Division taken.
Os. Mr. Norman; Mr. J. W. Lowther, *June 2*, 709.

Dobbie, Mr. [Ayr Burghs]

Education (Scotland) Bill, *Com., June 13*, 1581.

Docks
  Galway.
    Dredger for, Provision of.
      Q. Mr. C. Devlin; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 2*, 628.
    Lighting of, Harbour Board Arrangements for Improvement of, Object of Board of Works interference with, etc.
      Qs. Mr. C. Devlin, Col. Nolan; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *June 2*, 627–628.

Dockyards, Naval
  Devonport—Piecework System, Introduction of—Effect on number of men employed, etc.
    Q. Mr. Bell; *A.* Mr. Pretyman *June 13*, 1469.
  Malta—Date of completing extension.
    Q. Mr. Galloway; *A.* Mr. A. Lee, *June 8*, 1057.

Dogs
  Licences for.
    Amount received in fines in respect of people neglecting to take out.
      Qs. Mr. Weir, *May 31*, 481, 487; Mr. V. Cavendish, 487.
    Prosecutions for keeping without a Licence, Statistics of, for 1903 and 1904—Fines.
      Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *June 8*, 1073–1074.

Doncaster Corporation Bill
  l. 2R.* *May 17*, 2.

Donegal
  Landlords agreeing to sell under Land Act 1903, Names of—Valuation, Rents, etc., of Estates.
    Q. Mr. O'Doherty; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 6*, 783–784.

Donelan, Captain A. J. C. [Cork, E.]
  "Thistle" Launch—Cause of Sinking, *June 9*, 1213.

Donoughmore, Earl of—*Under-Secretary for War.*
  Seamen's and Soldiers' False Characters Bill, 2R., *June 7*, 912.
  Yeomanry.
    Arming of—Necessity for steel weapon, *June 13*, 1451.
    Establishment, Changes in—Reduction in strength of units, etc., *May 19*, 320–324.
    Inspection of, Arrangements as to, *June 13*, 1451.
    Musketry, Instruction in, at Hythe, *June 13*, 1451, 1452.
    Number of Regiments assembled for training between 18 May and 4 June—Number of Officers and Men in receipt of £5 Horse Allowance, *June 10*, 1264.

Donoughmore, Earl of—*cont.*
  Yeomanry—*cont.*
    Re-attestment, Period of, Alteration in, proposed, *June 13*, 1451.
    Signalling, Training in, Standard of, etc., *June 13*, 1453.
    Transport Arrangements, *June 13*, 1453, 1454.

Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir J. E. [Gloucester, Tewkesbury]
  Education, New Code—System of Grants—Substituting for Article 31 Articles 98 and 101 (a) of existing Code; *June 6*, 798–799.

Doughty, Sir G. [Great Grimsby]
  Iceland and the Faroe Islands, Telegraphic Communication with, Progress of establishing, *June 8*, 1069.

Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. A. [Kent, St. Augustine's]
  Aliens Bill.
    Expenses—Resolution as to, *June 8*, 1139, 1159.
    Motion to commit to Standing Committee on Law, *June 8*, 1087, 1093, 1104.
  Animals, Experiments on, Educational Value of—Report of Royal College of Physicians, *May 19*, 346.
  Antitoxin Serum, Prohibiting manufacture of, *May 31*, 428.
  Canada—Immigration Frauds, Government action as to, *June 8*, 1064.
  Criminals, Habitual, Treatment of—Tabling Communications between Home Office and H.M. Judges, proposed, *June 9*, 1224.
  Employment of Children Act—Sanctioning By-laws—Local Authorities prohibiting street trading by girls under sixteen, *June 6*, 796.
  Explosives—Coal Mines, Tests for explosives used in, *June 9*, 1223, 1224.
  Factories and Workshops.
    Act of 1901, Section 61, Rendering Enforcement more easy, *May 19*, 346.
    Bryant and May, Death of Employee of, from Phossy Jaw, *June 8*, 1065–1066.
  Jersey, Frenchwoman banished from, *May 18*, 163.
  Law Courts, Perjury in, Taking steps to suppress, *May 19*, 359.
  Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *June 6*, 812.
  Liquor Licensing, etc.—Number of Licences refused and ground of refusal in 1901 and 1902, *June 9*, 1209.
  London Street Traffic Commission, Date of Tabling Report of, etc., *June 8*, 1066.

[*cont.*

Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. A.—*cont.*
- Lunatics.
  - Asylums.
    - Bethlehem Royal Hospital, Violation of Lunacy Act, *May 18*, 180.
    - Indebtedness of Counties and County Boroughs for Erection and Maintenance of, etc.—Granting Return, *May 31*, 427.
  - Intemperance, Granting Return showing total Number of Lunacy cases due to, *June 8*, 1065.
- Mines.
  - Coal—Tests for Explosives, *June 9*, 1223, 1224.
  - Wet drilling in, Question of making compulsory in view of prevalence of Phthisis with dry system, *June 8*, 1068.
- Motor Cars—Traders' Licences under Act of 1903, Protection afforded by, etc., *May 19*, 347.
- Motor-Cycles—Furious Driving in Trafalgar Square and Pall Mall—Prosecuting Offenders, *May 17*, 40.
- Naturalisation Certificates — Proposed Reduction of Fees for, *May 17*, 33.
- Penal Servitude Bill, 2R., *June 3*, 722, 728.
  - Rules under, Publication of, by *The Times* before issuing to Members, Government Action as to, *June 8*, 1080-1081.
- Police.
  - Evidence in Cases between Private Litigants, Regulations as to giving—Case of Sievier *v.* Duke, *May 17*, 40-41.
  - Metropolitan Force — Length of Annual Leave, *June 7*, 919.
- Police Courts—Hearing of Juvenile Cases—Separating Juvenile from Adult Offenders, *May 18*, 163-164.
- Reformatory and Industrial Schools — Number of Boys in Proportion Benefiting by Treatment—Date of Tabling Report for 1903, *June 8*, 1067.
- Shop Hours Bill.
  - Date of Introduction, *May 19*, 417.
  - 2R. *June 1*, 608.
  - Committee Stage, Suggested Postponement of, to obtain Opinion of small Shop-keepers, *June 8*, 1066.
- Vagrancy—Legislation amending Acts as a whole, Suggested introduction of, *May 18*, 179.
- Westminster Bridge Tramway Terminus, Removal of, *May 31*, 427.
- Workmen's Compensation (Amendment) Bill—Date of Introduction, *May 19*, 417 ; *May 31*, 417.

Douglas, Mr. C. M. [Lanark, N.W.]
- Education [Scotland] Bill, *Com.*, *June 13*, 1588.
- Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *June 7*, 973.

Dover
- Custom House at—Inconvenient arrangements as to Inspection of Luggage.
  - *Os.* Mr. C. Hay, *May 31*, 439 ; Mr. V. Cavendish, 442 ; Mr. J. F. Hope, 443 ; Mr. Maconochie, 444.

Down
- Landlords and Tenants in, Number of—Names of Landlords agreeing to sell under Land Act, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. MacVeagh ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 6*, 801.

Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Provisional Order Bill
- *c.* 1R.* *May 19*, 338.
  - 2R.* *June 13*, 1461.

Drogheda
- Mortuary, Body left for Two Months in—Authorities responsible for Neglect—Steps to prevent Recurrence of Scandal.
  - *Q.* Mr. W. Moore ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 8*, 1054.

Drunkenness
- Ireland—Return presented, *June 13*, 1465.
- Lunacy due to, Granting Return showing Statistics of.
  - *Q.* Mr. H. Craig ; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *June 8*, 1064-1065.

Dublin
- College of Science.
  - Architects of—Rate of Remuneration.
    - *Q.* Mr. Mooney ; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *May 19*, 363.
  - Irish Materials and Workmen, giving Preference to.
    - *Q.* Mr. Field ; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *June 8*, 1077.
- Cycle Thefts in.
  - Crown, Legal Representation of, in Trial as to.
    - *Q.* Mr. Mooney ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 19*, 364.
  - Number of cycles purchased from Ferns by Irish Constabulary, &c.
    - *Q.* Mr. Mooney ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 13*, 1495, 1496.
- Four Courts, expediting Introduction of Electric Light into.
  - *Q.* Mr. Hemphill ; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *June 7*, 922.
- Hospitals—Report of Board of Superintendence with appendices for 1903-4, presented, *June 10*, 1327, 1368.
- Metropolitan Police—Statistical tables for 1903 presented, *May 31*, 424 ; *June 7*, 908.

[*cont.*

Dublin—*cont.*

Soldiers, prohibition of, from walking in main streets, alleged.
Qs. Mr. Sloan, Mr. Nannetti; *As.* Mr. W. B. Davenport, *June 13*, 1482.

Telegraph Office—Public Cross-Examination of Officials, investigating Practice of.
Q. Mr. Nannetti; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 19*, 349.

Trinity College.
Land Act, Obstructions caused to working of, by.
Qs. Mr. T. W Russell, *May 19*, 399, 400; Mr. Boland, 401.

Lands Commission—Names of Members.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *June 8*, 1076.

Victuallers' Association—Resolution protesting against Assessments levied on Members—Making Inquiries.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. A Chamberlain, *June 8*, 1076-1077.

Duke, Mr. H. E. [Plymouth]
Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *June 6*, 866.

Dulwich College
Schoolmasters' Increases of Salary, Income Tax Assements of—Case of Smyth v. Stretton—Securing Uniformity of Payments unper Schedule E., Income Tax Acts.
Q. Col. Lockwood; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *June 1*, 497.

Dundee, Broughty Ferry and District Tramways Order Confirmation Bill
c. 1R.* *June 1*, 490.
2R.* *June 9*, 1201.
*Con.** *June 13*, 1461.

Dungannon
Disturbances at—Action of Constabulary.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 18*, 182-183.

Durham
Administrative County of—Charities, Inquiry into.
Return presented, *June 8*, 1045.

Durness, Sutherland
Parochial Medical Officers (Scotland) Return 1903, Reason of omission from.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *June 8*, 1046-1047.

Durning-Lawrence, Sir E. [Cornwall, Truro]
Customs Department—Dismissal of staff engaged to levy the Corn Tax, proposed, *May 31*, 439.

Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir W. H. [Kent, Dartford]
Education—Block Grant, Change in, Effect of, on Amount earned, *May 19*, 361-362.

Dynamite
Transvaal—Import duty, Exclusion of British Manufacturers by, alleged.
Qs. Mr. Markham; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *June 9*, 1219.

Edinburgh.
Educational Area for Leith and, providing Uniform Bursary System over.
Q. Mr. M. Ferguson; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *June 6*, 782-783.

St. Giles' Cathedral—Military Services, alleged prohibition of—Question withdrawn.
O. Master of Elibank *June 13*, 1480.

Education, Board of
President—Marquess of Londonderry.
Parliamentary Secretary—Sir W. R. Anson.

Education
Church Attendance of Children in School Hours, Powers of Managers to compel, etc.
Q. Mr. Lawrence; *A.* Sir W. Anson, May 18, 181-182.
Q. Mr. Halsey; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *June 9*, 1206.

Defective and epileptic Children, grants for education of, Regulations presented *May 19*, 308, 342.

Expenditure on, Increase in, References to, in debate on the Finance Bill, *May 17*, 73, 91.

Expenses of Elementary Schools—making one Payment to Correspondent for distribution without involving Responsibility to Auditor, etc.
Q. Sir J. Rankin; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *June 10*, 1369.

Grants.
Amount earned by Elementary Schools, Effect of Change in Block Grant on—Effect on Rural Schools.
Qs. Sir W. Hart Dyke, Mr. H. Hobhouse; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *May 19*, 361-362.

Defective and Epileptic children, grants for education of, Regulations presented *May 19*, 308, 342.

New Code, System under—Substituting for Article 31 Articles 98 and 101 (a) of existing Code, etc.
Qs. Sir J. Dorington Sir Ed. Strachey; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *June 6*, 798-800.

Ireland.
Attendance, new Rules as to.
Q. Mr. Sheehy; *A.* Mr. Wyndham *June 13*, 1496.

Building plans, Decision as to.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 9*, 1227.

Education—*cont.*
Ireland—*cont.*
Commissioners' Estates — Granting Return showing Rentals, Receipts, Expenses etc.
Q. Mr. Mr. Murphy ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 17*, 42–43.
Donegal, Evening Classes in—Fees due to Teachers for Session ended Jan. 1904, Taking Steps to pay.
Q. Mr. O'Doherty ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 8*, 1054.
Intermediate Education.
Examinations—Rules, etc., Presented, *May 19*, 309, 341.
Report of Board (1903) Presented, *June 1*, 493 ; *June 7*, 909.
New Code — Examination Papers, Settlement of, by Committee of Three—Steps to carry out Pledge given.
Q. Mr. O'Doherty ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 8*, 1053–1054.
Teachers, *see title* National School Teachers, Ireland.
New Code.
Article 31—Additional charge on Local Rates—Facilities for Discussion.
Os. Sir E. Strachey, *June 6*, 807 ; Mr. Speaker, 807.
Grants, System of—Substituting for Article 31 Articles 98 and 101 (*a*) of Existing Code, etc.
Qs. Sir J. Dorington, Sir Ed. Strachey ; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *June 6*, 798–800.
Passive Resisters, Number of—gravity of the question, etc.
O. Mr. A. Davies, *May 19*, 414.
Pupil Teachers, *see under Subheading* Teachers.
Schools.
Political meetings, use of school buildings for.
Q. Mr. Hunt ; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *June 9*, 1227.
Poor Law, *see under* Poor Law—Children.
Scotland, *see their names under subheading* Scotland.
Scotland
Cummertrees, New School at, in place of Addition to old Building—Sanctioning Expenditure.
Q. Mr. Maxwell ; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *June 8*, 1075–1076.
Erbusaig School, arranging for New Water Supply for.
Q. Mr. Weir ; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *June 7*, 919-920.

Education—*cont.*
Scotland—*cont.*
Fund.
Amount payable under Sub-section (3), (E) and (F) of Clause 39.
Q. Sir H. Maxwell ; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *May 18*, 167–168.
Balance, approximate, per head of average attendance of scholars.
Q. Sir C. Renshaw ; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *May 18*, 168-169.
Report, Annual, presented, *June 1*, 493 ; *June 7*, 909.
Report on Gemeindeschulen (Berlin and Charlottenburg) presented, *June 8*, 1044 ; *June 9*, 1183.
Ross-shire Schools, Water Supply for, Arrangements as to.
Q. Mr. Weir ; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *June 7*, 919–920, 920.
Teachers.
Pupil— Age of Admission, Postponing Operation of Regulation fixing, at Sixteen.
Q. Mr. H. Hobhouse ; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *June 6*, 782.
Salaries, Increases of, Income Tax Assessments for—Securing Uniformity of Payment.
Q. Col. Lockwood ; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *June 1*, 497.

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (Birmingham) Bill
l. Com. May 19*, 307.
3R.* *June 7*, 907.
c. 1R.* *June 9*, 1202.

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London) Bill
c. 1R.* *May 17*, 26.
2R.* *June 3*, 714.

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (Swansea) Bill
c. 1R.* *May 17*, 24.
2R.* *June 3*, 714.
Rep.* *June 10*, 1365.
3R.* *June 13*, 1461.

Educational Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (Cardiff and Newport Monmouthshire) Bill
c. 2R., *June 13*, 1558.
Committees.
Councils, Members from—Co-option with outside Members, etc.
Os. Sir F. Powell, *June 13*, 1560, 1561 ; Dr. Macnamara, 1562, 1563 ; Sir W. Anson, 1564, 1565 ; Mr. Lloyd-George, 1566, 1567 ; Mr. G. Boscawen, 1569, 1570 ; Mr. S. Evans, 1570, 1571.

[*cont.*

Educational Board Provisional Orders, &c. —*cont.*

Committees—*cont.*

Roman Catholic Representation on, question of.
Os. Mr. Boland, *June 13*, 1558, 1559; Mr. Power, 1560; Dr. Macnamara, 1563; Col. Nolan, 1564; Sir W. Anson, 1566; Mr. Lloyd-George, 1568; Mr. G. Boscawen, 1569; Lord E. Talbot, 1570; Mr. S. Evans, 1571; Sir J. Lawrence, 1572.

Education Department, Scotland

Vice-President of Council—Mr. A. Graham Murray.

Secretary—Sir Henry Craik.

Education [Scotland] Bill

c. Com., *June 13*, 1505.

Debate on Committee [Commons], *June 13*, 1505.

Ad hoc principle, reasons for abolishing in England and retaining in Scotland, 1589, 1590.

Amendments placed on the Paper by the Government, Information as to, 1506, 1508–1510, 1525.

County as administrative area for education purposes, proposed, 1523–1532, 1534.

Power to sub-divide into districts, proposed, 1532–1535, 1537, 1538.

Date of coming into force, Postponement of, proposed, 1539–1545.

Districts, creation of, in lieu of parochial School Boards, 1505, 1511, 1512, 1517–1521, 1524.

Elementary Education, interests of, sacrificed to those of Secondary Education, alleged, 1516, 1517, 1519, 1521, 1531.

Extension of, to England and Wales, Instructions as to, out of order, 1505.

Financial Arrangements—Pooling into one fund, proposed, 1527.

Govan, Inclusion of, in Glasgow District, Objections to, 1536, 1552–1557, 1573–1575.

Island Parishes, Method of dealing with, 1519–1521, 1523.

Leith, Inclusion of, in Edinburgh District, Objections to, 1577–1584, 1586.

Local Authorities, Powers of, decreased, alleged, 1509, 1513.

Local Government Districts, Combination or Sub-division of, Powers as to, 1535, 1536, 1543.

Local Management Committees.

Arrangements as to, to be left to School Boards, proposed, 1508, 1510.

Education [Scotland] Bill—*cont.*

Debate on Committee, &c.—*cont.*

Local Management Committees—*cont.*

Clauses as to, deleted from the Bill, 1506–1508, 1510.

Expenses of Representatives, Question as to, 1507.

Orders laid on the Table, Opportunity for Discussion of, prior to Act coming into force, 1540–1548.

Outlying Districts, Transit facilities for Scholars from, 1527.

Parochial Area, Proposed Abolition of, 1505, 1511, 1512, 1517–1520, 1535.

Parochial Schools, Abolition of, 1505, 1516.

Pollokshaws, Inclusion of, in Glasgow District, 1526, 1588.

Rutherglen, Inclusion of, in Glasgow District, 1585–1587.

School Boards.

Abolition of present system, 1511.

Reasons for Abolishing in England and Retaining in Scotland, 1589, 1590.

Adjoining Districts, Joint Committee for, 1545, 1546.

Area, Proposals as to, 1505, 1506, 1511.

Teachers.

Improved position of, under the Bill, 1518.

Promotion of, Proposals as to, 1514.

Leith and Edinburgh, Joint Area for, providing uniform Bursary System over.
Q. Mr. M. Ferguson; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *June 6*, 782–783.

Egypt

Arbitration Treaty between Great Britain and France, *see under* France.

British Subjects in—Total Number—Proportion of Maltese.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 31*, 431–432.

Suez Canal—Shipping and Tonnage—Return presented, *May 19*, 308–342.

Elections

see Parliamentary Elections.

Electric Lighting Act, 1888

Reports under, presented, *June 9*, 1204; *June 10*, 1327.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill

l. 2R.* *May 19*, 307.
*Com.** *June 9*, 1183.
Rep.* *June 10*, 1326.
3R.* *June 13*, 1418.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill

l. 2R* *June 10*, 1326.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill
l. 2R.* *June 10*, 1326.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill
l. 2R.* *May 17*, 3.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill
c. 2R.* *June 3*, 714.
Nature of Proposals under.
Return ordered, *May 19*, 343; Presented, *June 1*, 493.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill
c. 1R.* *May 17*, 24.
2R.* *June 3*, 714.
Nature of Proposals under.
Return ordered, *May 19*, 343; *Presented*, *June 1*, 494.

Electric Railways
Safety of Passengers, Steps taken to secure.
O. Mr. Weir, *June 2*, 712.

Elibank, Master of [Edinburgh, Midlothian]
Edinburgh—St. Giles' Cathedral, Alleged prohibition of Military Services in, *June 13*, 1480.
Transvaal—Zoutpansberg, Alleged unrest among the Natives of, *June 13*, 1486.

Ellice, Captain E. C. [St. Andrews Burghs]
Musical Copyright Bill, *Con.*, *June 10*, 1412.
Transvaal, Importation of Chinese Labour to—Sale of Intoxicants to Labourers—Arrangements, *May 17*, 37; *June 8*, 1061.

Elliot, Hon. A. R. D. [Durham]
Finance Bill, 2R., *May 17*, 108.
Navy—Chilian Battleships, Purchase of, by the Government, *May 17*, 110.

Ellis, Mr. J. E.—*Temporary Chairman of Committees.* [Nottingham, Rushcliffe].
Aliens Bill—Motion to Commit to Standing Committee on Law, *June 8*, 1103.
Borough Councils, Indebtedness of, Return No. 114 of Session 1904 relating to—Grand Totals of Columns 1 to 11, *June 1*, 494.
Expenditure, Increase in, and growth of Taxation, *May 17*, 117–121.
Finance Bill, 2R., *May 17*, 116.
Transvaal.
Chinese Labour, Introduction of—Resolutions by Australian Parliament—Divisional Figures—Terms, *May 18*, 176-177.
Commissoners of Mines and Railways, Names, Salaries, Previous Experience, etc., of, *June 6*, 790.
Magistracy—Names, Ages, Experience, etc., of Nominees, *May 18*, 177.

Elysee Palace Hotel Company Bill
c. Con. *May 17*, 23.
3R.* *May 31*, 421.
l. Commons' Amendments, *Con.* *June 13*, 1418.

Emigration and Immigration
Canada, Emigration to.
Frauds as to—Government Action.
Q. Mr. C. Devlin; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *June 8*, 1064.
Poor Law Children, Number of, Emigrated to, in 1903.
Q. Mr. H. Samuel; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *June 13*, 1473.
Ireland—Increase in Emigration due to over-taxation, alleged—References to, in the Debate on the Finance Bill, *May 18*, 192, 209, 210, 212, 242.

Emmott, Mr. A. [Oldham]
Anglo-French Convention Bill, 2R., *June 1*, 575.
Congo Free State, Administration of, by the Belgian Government, Treatment of Natives, etc., *June 9*, 1251–1257.
Division challenged frivolously—Members requested to rise in their places—Position of Members already in the Lobbies, *June 2*, 706, 707.
India, Cotton Growing in, Existence of Natural Fertilisers in proximity to Land suitable for, *June 3*, 718.
Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *June 6*, 816, 878.

Employment of Children Act
By-Laws, sanctioning of—Street Trading by Girls under Sixteen, Local Authorities prohibiting.
Q. Mr. Tenant; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *June 6*, 796.

"Enchantress" Yacht
Cost of Commission, speed trials, coal consumption, etc.
Qs. Mr. G. Bowles; *As.* Mr. Pretyman, *June 9*, 1210; *June 13*, 1467, 1468.

Enfield Small Arms Factory
See under Army.

Ennis
Postmastership—Date of becoming Vacant—Advertising in Post Office Circular.
Q. Mr. Nannetti; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 19*, 349.

Enteric Fever
Inoculation against, Tabling Report of Committee of Inquiry.
Q. Mr. E. Wason; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *June 6*, 788–789.

Erbusaig
Schools, arranging for new Water Supply for.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *June 7*, 919, 920.

Erne, Lough
Drainage Charges—Inclusion in Inquiry as to Trinity College rents, proposed.
Q. Mr. T. W. Russell ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 13*, 1492, 1493.

Erroll, Earl of
Yeomanry.
Development and Efficiency of—War Office Order for Reduction of Establishment, etc., *May 19*, 317-319.
Equipment, Training, Inspection and Organisation of, *June 13*, 1446-1448.

Esmonde, Sir T. G. [Wexford, N.]
Customs Duties in Ireland, Incidence of—Appointment of Committee of Inquiry, *May 18*, 248.
Finance Bill, 2R., *May 18*, 247.
Financial relations between England and Ireland, *May 18*, 247.
War Office Clerks, Abstractor, compulsory Retirement of, at Age of Sixty—Civil Service Clerks gazetted to War Office, etc., *June 1*, 495-496.

Estate Duty
Office—Changes in constitution and working of, Effect on collection of revenue.
Os. Mr. G. Bowles, *May 31*, 482-484 ; Mr. V. Cavendish, 484.

Estimates
Criticisms on, hampered by new Procedure Rules.
Os. Mr. Robson, *May 17*, 102, 104 ; Mr. Goddard, 128, 129.

Evans, Mr. S. T. [Glamorgan, Mid]
Education Board Provisional Orders [Cardiff and Newport Monmouthshire] Bill, 2R., *June 13*, 1570.

Evictions, Ireland
Killorglin, securing Re-instatement of Francis Butler at.
Q. Mr. Murphy ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 19*, 365.
Longford Estate, Westmeath, Application of A. Caddell for Re-instatement.
Q. Mr. Sullivan ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 6*, 801.
Statistics as to Applications for Re-instatement, and Re-instatements made.
Q. Mr. Cullinan ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 6*, 785-786.
Teenan Estate, Ejectment Decrees served to Tenants on—Enabling Tenants to purchase Holdings, etc.
Q. Mr. S. Macneill ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 10*, 1370-1371.

Expenditure
see Revenue and Expenditure.

Explosives
Coal Mines, Tests for explosives in.
Qs. Mr. Markham ; *As.* Mr. A. Douglas, *June 9*, 1223, 1224.
Curtis and Harvey, Messrs., Explosion at Works of, Report Presented, *June* 776 ; *June 7*, 910.
Report, Annual, Presented, *June 2*, *June 7*, 910.

Factories and Workshops
Act of 1901, Section 61, rendering enforcement more easy.
Q. Mr. Shackleton ; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *May 19*, 346.
Bryant and May, Death of Employee of, from Phossy Jaw, making Investigation as to.
Qs. Mr. Crooks, Sir C. Dilke ; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *June 8*, 1065-1066.

Fair Rents, Ireland
Second-Term—Case of Mr. H. Halpin, of Whitestown.
Q. Mr. J. O'Connor ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 18*, 171.

Falkland Islands
Report, Annual, Presented, *May 31*, 423 ; *June 7*, 908.

Faroe Islands
Telegraphic Communication between Iceland, Great Britain and, Progress of.
Q. Mr. Doughty ; *A.* Lord Stanley, *June 8*, 1069.

Farquharson, Dr. R. [Aberdeenshire, W.]
Army Medical Vote, Date of Discussion on, *June 2*, 631.
Business of the House, Course of, *June 8*, 1082.
Salisbury, late Marquess of, Arrangements concerning Memorial to, *May 18*, 184 ; *May 31*, 435-436.
Shop Hours Bill, 2R., *June 1*, 590.
Motor Cars—Parks, Regulations in, speed limit, etc., *June 9*, 1225.
Parliamentary Procedure — New Rules, Working of, Inquiry into proposed, *May 19*, 369.

Farrell, Mr. J. P. [Longford, N.]
Post Office—West of Ireland to Belfast, Delay in transmission of Mails from, Steps to be taken as to, *June 3*, 717-718.

Fee Fund
House of Lords—Account Presented, *May 31*, 424.

Feeble Minded
Children in Poor Law Schools—Improved system of instruction.
O. Mr. Crooks, *June 2*, 651.
Workhouses, Treatment in.
O. Mr. J. Hutton *June 2*, 656.

Fellowes, Mr. A. E. [Huntingdonshire, Ramsey]
- Railway Rates and Transit Facilities for Fish — Extending Scope of Inquiry, *May 17*, 41.
- Seeds, Adulteration of, *May 18*, 180.

Ferguson, Mr. R. C. M. [Leith Burghs]
- Aliens Bill—Expenses, Resolution as to, *June 8*, 1149.
- Customs Department Boatmen.
  - Appointment of, Objections to System of Nomination, *May 31*, 455.
  - Sunday Duty, granting extra pay for, proposed, *May 31*, 455.
- Education [Scotland] Bill, *Com. June 13*, 1582.
  - Leith and Edinburgh, Joint Area for, *June 6*, 782-783.
- Workhouses, Scotch—Report of Departmental Committee, *June 6* 783.

Fergusson, Rt. Hon. Sir J. [Manchester, N.E.]
- Education [Scotland] Bill, *Com. June 13*, 1521.
- Licensing Bill, *Com. June 6*, 829.

Ffrench, Mr. P. [Wexford, S.]
- Bee-keeping—Foul brood, Destruction of Bees suffering from, *June 13*, 1476.
- Waggons, Loaded—Regulation as to width of tyre, Alteration of, proposed, *June 13*, 1476.
- Whisky, Manufacture of, from impure materials—Government Protection of Growers of cereals, proposed, *June 13*, 1477.

Field, Mr. W. [Dublin, St. Patrick]
- Board of Trade—Establishment of Department in Ireland, proposed, *May 18*, 248.
- Cotton Corners.
  - American Preventive Measures, obtaining and tabling Information as to, *May 19*, 345.
  - Zurich Congress Suggestion of International Co-operation to prevent, *June 7*, 932.
- Dublin.
  - College of Science—Giving Preference to Irish Materials and Workmen, *June 8*, 1077.
  - Victuallers' Association, Protest against Assessment levied on Members of—Making Inquiries, *June 8*, 1076-1077.
- Finance Bill, 2R., *May 18*, 248.
- Financial relations between England and Ireland, *May 18*, 248.
- Income Tax Abatements, allowing, on Cost of Repairs to House Property, *June 7*, 927.
- Tralee and Dingle Railway, Negotiations as to, *June 7*, 929.

Filey Improvement Bill
- *l.* 3R.* *May 19*, 306.
- *c.* 1R.* *May 19*, 340.
  - 2 R.* *June 7*, 914.

Finance Bill
- *c.* 2R. *May 17*, 57 ; *May 18*, 186.
- (*For details of debate, see titles* Revenue and Expenditure, Taxation, National Debt, Tea, etc.)
- Date of Discussion on.
  - *Q.* Mr. Lough ; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 2*, 631.

Financial Secretary to the Admiralty—
- *Mr. E. G. Pretyman.*

Financial Secretary to the War Office
- *Mr. W. Bromley-Davenport.*

First Commissioner of Works
- *Lord Windsor.*

First Lord of the Admiralty
- *Earl of Selborne.*

First Lord of the Treasury
- *Mr. Arthur J. Balfour.*

Fiscal Policy—Free Trade *v.* Protection
- *Debate on Motion* [Mr. Black], *May 18*, 253.
  - Amendment by the Prime Minister.
    - Carrying over debate in order to consider, proposed, 269.
    - Reasons for, and objections to, 254, 259, 263, 265, 268, 269, 273, 279, 287, 292, 295, 297, 298.
  - Chamberlain, Mr., policy of.
    - Government attitude towards, 257, 260, 277.
    - Motion directed against, 266, 267, 279, 280.
    - Opportunity for Discussing, Necessity for, 270, 271, 278-280, 282.
  - Conservative Members differing from Government on Fiscal Question, Position of, 260, 261, 285.
  - Evasions of Discussion and Responsibility on the Part of the Government, 295-297.
  - Food, Taxation of.
    - Country, Opinion of, 257, 258, 273.
    - Government Attitude towards, 255, 257-259, 261, 272, 275.
  - Motion a Vote of Censure, 253, 262-267, 270, 272, 274, 284, 287, 290, 292, 297.
  - Pledge, Government, not to raise the question during present Parliament, 281, 290, 292, 293.
  - Policy of the Government.
    - Cabinet Responsibility, Doctrine of, 264, 279, 289.

[*cont.*

Fiscal Policy—Free Trade *v.* Protection—*—cont.*
Debate on Motion—cont.
Policy of the Government—*cont.*
Chamberlain, Mr., Attitude of, 276, 277, 279, 282.
Declarations by Ministers, 263, 264, 267, 269, 289.
Evasions of Discussion and Responsibility on the part of the Government, 295–297.
Raw Material, Taxation of, Government Attitude towards, 255.
Sheffield Policy.
Present Parliament not to deal with, 262, 263.
Terms of—Government Adherence to, etc., 262, 263, 275, 286, 292.
Unionist Party, Future of, endangered, 283–285, 290.
Amendment to Mr. Black's Motion by the Prime Minister.
Amendment handed in after the Speaker had left the Chair—Special Privileges granted to Ministers of the Crown, Alleged.
Os. Mr. Markham, *May 18*, 184; Mr. Speaker, 185.
Opportunity for Discussing Amendment, proposed.
Q. Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *May 18*, 184, 185.
Terms of, Communicating, to the House.
Q. Mr. Dalziel; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *May 17*, 155, 156.
Changes in—Discussion in the House, Necessity for.
Os. Sir C. Dilke, *May 19*, 385; Mr. Lloyd-George, 399.
Free Food Debate 18th May, Affording Facilities for Resumption of.
Q. Mr. H. Johnstone; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 1*, 498.
Plain Issue Shirked by the Government, alleged.
Os. Mr. Pirie, Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 9*, 1231.

Fish
Railway Rates for Carriage of—Extending Scope of Inquiry of Committee on Rates for Agricultural Produce.
Q. Mr. Crombie; *A.* Mr. A. Fellowes, *May 17*, 41.

Fisheries
Ireland.
Ardglass Herring Fishery Inquiry, Result of.
Q. Mr. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 2*, 626.
Cooscroum Landing Stage — Inadequacy of Improvement made by Congested Districts Board—Providing Proper Facilities.
O. Mr. Boland, *May 19*, 401.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 19*, 364–365.

Fisheries—*cont.*
Ireland—*cont.*
Kerry, North.
Applications for Improved Facilities from Beale and Gullane—Action of Congested Districts Board.
Q Mr. Flavin; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 19*, 366.
Number of Congested Fishery Districts in—Expenditure of Congested Districts Board, etc.
Q. Mr. Flavin; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 17*, 44.
Loch Leven Trout, Arranging to lay down, in the Upper Bann River.
Q. Mr. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 3*, 719.
Rod and Net Fishing—Granting Return showing Opening and Closing Dates.
Qs. Mr. Flavin, Mr. Joyce; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 17*, 44–45.
Piers, *see title* Piers and Harbours.
Scotland—Annual Report Presented, *May 31*, 423; *June 7*, 908.
Trawling, *see that title.*

Fitzgerald Estate, Mayo
Grazing Farms, Sale of, by Private Treaty—Securing Grazing Land for Benefit of Congested Areas.
Q. Dr. Ambrose; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 18*, 170; *June 7*, 921–922.

Fitzmaurice, Lord E. G. [Wiltshire, Cricklade]
Aliens Bill—Motion to Commit to Standing Committee on Law, *June 8*, 1104, 1109.
Congo Free State, Administration of, by the Belgian Government, Treatment of Natives, etc., *June 9*, 1267-1272.
Musical Copyright Bill, *Con.*, *June 10*, 1386.
Smugglers, Capture of—Amount of Estimate for, etc., *May 31*, 471.

Fitzroy, Mr. E. A. [Northants, S.]
Thames River Steamboat Service Bill, *Con. June 2*, 697.

Fitzwilliam Estate
Tenants of, Ejectment Processes Served to—Accepting Landlord's Terms of Sale, etc.
Qs. Mr. J. O' Connor, Mr. T. W. Russell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 2*, 624–625.
Q. Mr. J. O'Connor; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 6*, 803.

Flavin, Mr. M. J. [Kerry, N.]
Fisheries.
Kerry, North, in, *see subheading* Kerry.

[*cont.*

Flavin, Mr. M. J.—*cont.*
- Fisheries—*cont.*
  - Rod and Net Fishing, Granting Return showing Opening and Closing Dates for, *May 17*, 44–45.
- Kerry, North.
  - Congested Electoral Divisions in, Number of — Expenditure on Fisheries 1897 to 1903, etc., *May 17*, 44.
  - Fisheries of — Applications for improved Facilities from Beale and Gullane — Action of Congested Districts Board, *May 19*, 366.
- Land Act, Working of—Obstruction by Trinity College and the Landlords, *May 19*, 401, 402.
- Listowel and Tarbet Coach Service—Contract Price—Inviting Local Tenders, etc., *May 17*, 45–46; *May 19*, 365–366.

Flower, Sir E. F. S. [Bradford, W.]
- Militia and Volunteers, Norfolk Commission on — Date of Putting Recommendations in force, *June 13*, 1478.
- Penal Servitude Bill, 2R., *June 3*, 743.
- Poor Law Children — Schools, Overcrowding, etc. in—Failure of Barrack School System, *June 2*, 639, 640.

Flynn, Mr. J. C. [Cork, N.]
- Adams Estate, near Cork—Dealing with single Application for Re-instatement on Landlord's Terms, *May 19*, 344.
- Cork, Constabulary in, 1892 and 1893—Statutory Strength and Strength maintained, *May 19*, 344–345.
- Finance Bill, 2R., *May 18*, 229.
- Taxation of Ireland—Protests against Over-taxation, etc., *May 18*, 229–231.
- Tibet Expedition.
  - Discussion, Allowing Opportunity for, *May 18*, 184.
  - Lhasa, Advance to.
    - Chinese Assent to, *May 19*, 358, 359.

Food
- Adulteration of.
  - Acts, Working of, under Local Government Board Administration.
    - *O.* Mr. Kearley, *June 2*, 669, 670.
  - Milk, *see that title.*
- Taxation of, *see under* Fiscal Policy.

Food Supply in Time of War
- Commission of Inquiry on — Terms of reference.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Runciman; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 13*, 1501, 1502.

Foreign Office
- *Secretary of State*—Marquess of Lansdowne
- *Under-Secretary*—Earl Percy.

Foster, Sir B. W. [Derbyshire, Ilkeston]
- Aliens Bill—Expenses, Resolution as to, *June 8*, 1153.
- Deaths, List of, supplied by Registrars in Country Places to Weekly Newspapers.—Continuing Practice, *June 8*, 1048.
- Poor Law Children suffering from Ringworm and Ophthalmia, Statistics as to, *June 13*, 1471.
- Shop Hours Bill, 2R., *June 1*, 596, 607.

Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir H. H. [Wolverhampton, East]
- Aliens Bill.
  - Expenses, Resolution as to, *June 8*, 1158.
  - Motion to Commit to Standing Committee on Law, *June 8*, 1115.
- British Guiana Ordinance 1891—Tabling Correspondence between Indian and Colonial Offices, *May 18*, 178.
- Crown Agents—Tabling Audited Accounts 1900 to 1902, *May 18*, 174.
- Expenditure, increase in, and growth of taxation, *May 17*, 78–88.
- Finance Bill, 2R., *May 17*, 76.
- Transvaal.
  - Chinese Labour, Importation of—Date of Tabling Regulations, *May 18*, 174.
  - Native Labour — Wages — *June 13*, 1485.
- Victoria and Albert Museum—Building—Number of men employed, *June 9*, 1205.

France
- Arbitration Treaty with Great Britain.
  - *Debate on* Anglo-French Convention Bill, *June 1*, 499.
    - Congo, French — Concessions, Regime of, Dispute as to, 542, 543, 576, 577.
    - Egypt.
      - British Sphere of Influence in, Recognition of, 500, 533, 539.
      - Commercial Freedom, and Equality of Opportunity, Agreement as to, 500, 508.
      - Financial Freedom gained by, 508–510, 549, 564.
      - Political *status* of, Retention of, 532, 533.
      - Suez Canal, *see that sub-heading.*
    - French Press Comments, 556.

[*cont.*

France—*cont.*
- Arbitration Treaty with—*cont.*
  - *Debate on, etc.—cont.*
    - Gibraltar, Straits of, Free Navigation of, guaranteed, 500.
    - Iles de Los, Cession of, to France, 500, 560.
    - Madagascar and Zanzibar—Commercial Rights, etc., Settlement of, 501, 502, 530, 565.
    - Morocco.
      - Commercial Freedom, and Equality of Opportunity, Agreement as to, 500, 507, 546, 550-553, 557, 558, 564, 569, 574.
      - Consultation of Moroccan and Spanish Governments, 503, 504.
      - French Sphere of Influence in, Recognition of, 500, 533, 534, 539, 557.
      - Mediterranean and Atlantic Sea-board of, Agreement as to Non-fortification of, 500, 533.
      - Protestant Missions and Schools, Position of, 566.
      - *Status quo*, Maintenance of, 504, 518, 533.
      - New Hebrides, Jurisdiction over, 502, 530.
    - Newfoundland.
      - British Sovereignty over, Antiquity of, 526.
      - Consulting Government of, 528-530, 538, 548.
      - Development of, Arrested, owing to French Monopolies, 527, 528, 546, 547.
      - Fishing Rights.
        - British, 511.
        - French, and Purchase of Bait, 512, 549, 559, 560.
      - Money Indemnity to be paid to France, 500, 528, 530, 549.
      - Privileges enjoyed by France under the Treaty of Utrecht, Surrender of, 500, 526, 527, 564, 572.
    - Nigeria—Re-adjustment of Boundaries, 501.
    - Parliamentary Approval of Treaties, Doctrine of, 525, 536.
    - Senegambia, Extension of Colony of, to include Yarbutenda, 501.
    - Siam.
      - British and French Spheres of Influence, Definition of, 501, 513, 531, 532, 540, 541, 545, 550, 565, 570.

France—*cont.*
- Arbitration Treaty with—*cont.*
  - *Debate on, etc.—cont.*
    - Siam—*cont.*
      - Consultation of Siamese Government, 503.
      - German Interests in, 545.
      - Integrity of, Recognition of 503, 504, 541, 545, 550, 564, 565.
    - Trade Interests in, Steps taken to safeguard, 540, 541.
    - Slave-running, Protection of French Flag for—Omission of Settlement of Question, 544.
    - Suez Canal.
      - Convention of 1885, Terms of, 505.
      - Free Navigation of, Guaranteed, 500, 506.
    - Trade Interests of Great Britain, Abandonment of, 550, 555, 557—559, 566.
    - Unsettled Points of Controversy, 502, 537, 538, 542-544, 562.
  - Expenses, Committee to consider, *June 2*, 631.
  - Morocco, Tabling Communications with.
    - *Q.* Mr. S. Ormsby-Gore; *A.* Earl Percy, *June 8*, 1064.
  - Newfoundland, Benefit to, and Contribution from.
    - *Q.* Mr. Runciman; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *June 3*, 720-721.
  - Notes exchanged between Marquess of Lansdowne and the French Ambassador.
    - Copy presented, *May 31*, 425; *June 7*, 909.
- Army of—Expenditure, Normal annual, in the past twenty-five years,
  - *Q.* Mr. Runciman; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *May 18*, 161-162.
- Navy of—Expenditure, Normal annual, in each of past twenty-five years, Obtaining information as to, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. Runciman; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *May 18*, 169;
  - *Q.* Mr. Runciman; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *June 1*, 497;
  - *Q.* Mr. Runciman; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *June 8*, 1045-1046.
- Trade Reports, presented, *June 7*, 908; *June 10*, 1326; *June 13*, 1418.

Free Food
- *see* Fiscal Policy.

Free Trade *v.* **Protection**
- *see* Fiscal Policy.

Freeman-Thomas, Mr. F. [Hastings]
Post Office.
Collections—Weight to be conveyed by One Man with Handcart, *May 17*, 34.
Hastings, Increased Salaries for Officials at, *May 17*, 34.
St. Leonards-on-Sea, Sorting of Parcels at—Petition to Hastings Postmaster, enquiring into, *May 17*, 34-35.

Friendly Societies
Fund—Accounts (1903), presented, *June 13*, 1418, 1466.
Unregistered, Position of—Action of Inland Revenue Authorities in levying Income Tax on, etc.
Qs. Mr. G. Whiteley, *May 31*, 473–475, 476; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 476, 477, 479; Mr. Wallace, Mr. G. Bowles, 477; Sir E. Strachey, 478.

Galloway, Mr. W. J. [Manchester, S.W.]
Aliens Bill.
Expenses, Resolution as to, *June 8*, 1147.
Motion to commit to Standing Committee on Law, *June 8*, 1090.
London Street Traffic Commission, Date of Tabling Report of, etc., *June 8*, 1066.
Malta Dockyard, Extension of—Date of completing work, *June 8*, 1057.
Musical Copyright Bill, *Com.*, *June 10*, 1385, 1387, 1388, 1389, 1405.
Reformatory Schools, Number of Boys in, etc., *June 8*, 1067.
Shop Hours Bill, suggested Postponement of Committee Stage, *June 8*, 1066.
Thames River Steamboat Service Bill, *Con.*, *June 2*, 689, 690.

Galway
Docks.
Dredger for, Provision of.
Q. Mr C. Devlin; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 2*, 628.
Lighting of, Harbour Board Arrangements for Improvement of, Object of Board of Works Interference with, etc.
Qs. Mr. C. Devlin, Col. Nolan; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *June 2*, 627–628.
Drainage of the County, Reports as to—Obtaining Engineer's Report.
Q. Col. Nolan; *A.* Mr. Cavendish, *June 6*, 803-804.
Mill Stream, Wreck of Board of Works' Boat in, arranging for Removal of.
Q. Mr. C. Devlin; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *June 6*, 803.
Shambles Barracks at, Condemned Buildings of, Steps to dispose of.
Q. Mr. C. Devlin; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *June 6*, 790.

Galway, Viscount
Yeomanry.
Establishment, Changes in—Proposed reduction in strength of Units, *May 19*, 325.
Musketry, Instruction in, *June 13*, 1449.
Special Service Squadron Scheme, *May 16*, 324.

Gambia
Revenue and Expenditure, and Trade from 1895—Statement presented, *June 6*, 775; *June 7*, 910.

Gardner, Mr. E. [Berkshire, Wokingham]
Motor Cars—Departmental Committee recommendations—Consideration of County Council representations, proposed, *June 9*, 1225; *June 13*, 1490.

Gas
Metropolitan, Testing—Committee Report presented, *June 7*, 910, 918.

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill
l. 2R.* *June 7*, 907.

Gas Orders Confirmation Bill
l. 2R.* *May 19*, 307.

Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill
l. 2R* *June 10*, 1326.

Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 3) Bill
l. 2R* *June 7*, 907.

Germany
Army—Expenditure, normal annual, in the past twenty-five years.
Q. Mr. Runciman; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *May 18*, 161–162.
Gemeindeschulen, Report on, presented, *June 8*, 1044; *June 9*, 1183.
Navigation Schools—Report presented, *June 7*, 908.
Navy—Expenditure, normal annual, in each of past twenty-five years, obtaining Information as to, etc.
Q. Mr. Runciman; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *May 18*, 169; *June 8*, 1045–1046.
Q. Mr. Runciman; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *June 1*, 497.
Russian Agreement as to Customs Duties, giving Information as to.
Q. Major Evans Gordon; *A.* Earl Percy, *June 1*, 1062–1063.
Trade Report presented, *May 19*, 308.

Gilhooly, Mr. J. [Cork Co., E.]
Quit, Crown and Tithe Rents, Redemption of, *May 18*, 183.

Glasgow
Milk Supply—Inspection of Cows by Veterinary Surgeons, proposed.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. G. Lawson, *June 13*, 1489.

Goddard, Mr. [Ipswich]
  Estimates, Lack of Parliamentary Control over, *May 17*, 128–131.
  Finance Bill, 2R., *May 17*, 127.
  Parliamentary Procedure — New Rules, Criticism on Estimates, etc., hampered by, *May 17*, 128, 129.

Goktiek Railway Bridge
  Condition of, name of constructor, &c.
    Q. Mr. W. F. D. Smith; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 13*, 1475.

Gold Coast
  Railway.
    Price paid to Crown Agents for construction of—Nature of the work, etc.
      Os. Earl of Portsmouth, *June 10*, 1331, 1332; Duke of Marlborough, 1352.
    Rates charged compared with those of other African Railways.
      Os. Earl of Portsmouth, *June 10*, 1332.
  Revenue and Expenditure, and trade, from 1895—Statement presented, *June 6*, 775; *June 7*, 910.

Gomersal Gas Bill
  l. Rep.* *May 17*, 1.
    3R.* *June 7*, 906.
  c. Lords' Amendments *Con.* June 13*, 141.

Gordon, Major W. Evans [Tower Hamlets, Stepney]
  Customs Department Boatmen, Duties of, Scale of pay and chances of promotion, etc., *May 31*, 450–455, 460.
  Russo-German Agreement as to Customs Duties, giving Information as to, *June 8*, 1062–1063.

Gorst, Right Hon. Sir J. E. [Cambridge University.]
  Congo Free State, Administration of, by the Belgian Government, Treatment of Natives, etc., *June 9*, 1257–1261.
  Customs Department—Employees' Grievances, Consideration of, *May 31*, 472.
  Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *June 6*, 824, 825, 828, 873.
  Poor Law Children.
    Emigration of, to the Colonies, *June 2*, 642.
    "Scattered Homes" System, Advantages of, *June 2*, 644–646.
    Schools, Overcrowding in, *June 2*, 643.
    Workhouses, undesirability of retaining in—Carrying out Recommendations of Committee of 1895, *June 2*, 642.
  Transvaal.
    Chinese Labour, Importation of—Wages, *June 13*, 1484.
    Native Labour from British Central Africa.

Gorst, Right Hon. Sir J. E.—*cont.*
  Transvaal—*cont.*
    Native Labour, etc.—*cont.*
      Latest Date of Importation in 1904—Prohibiting Importation in Winter, *June 6*, 791.
      Wages of Central Africans, *June 9*, 1212.
    Vagrant Children, Control of—Necessity for legislation, *June 2*, 647, 648.

Goschen, Mr. G. J. [Sussex, E. Grinstead]
  Fiscal Policy—Taxation of Food, Attitude of Government towards, *May 18*, 258.

Gosport Water Bill
  l. Commons' Amendts., *Con.* May 19*, 305.

Govan Burgh (Electricity) Bill
  c. Rep.* *May 17*, 25.
    3R.* *May 31*, 421.

Government Ships Bill
  c. 1R.* *May 18*, 186.

Government Stock
  Unclaimed Dividends, Annual Return giving Alphabetical List of, suggested Publication of.
    Q. Sir J. Leng; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *May 18*, 179.

Grant, Mr. C. [Warwickshire, Rugby]
  Bethlehem Royal Hospital, Violation of Lunacy Act at, *May 18*, 179–180.
  Rugby Rifle Range — Allowing Town Volunteers same privilege as School Corps, *May 19*, 353.
  Vaccination Prosecutions, Lambeth — Employment of Solicitor by Vaccination Officer, *June 9*, 1210.

Gray, Mr. E. [West Ham, N.]
  Civil Service — Assistant Clerks (New Class), Replying to Memorials from, *May 19*, 349.
  Customs Department Staff—Dismissal of Staff engaged to levy the Corn Tax, proposed, *May 31*, 439–441.
  London County Council (Tramways and Improvements) Bill, *Con. June 9*, 1311.
  Shop Hours Bill, 2R., *June 1*, 598.
  Thames River Steamboat Service Bill, *Con. June 2*, 680, 692.

Great Central Railway Bill
  l. 2R.* *May 17*, 2.

Great Central and Midland Joint Railways Bill
  l. 2R.* *June 9*, 1182.

Great Northern Railway Bill
  l. Rep.* *June 10*, 1325.

Great Western Railway Bill
  l. 3R.* *May 19*, 306.
  c. 1R.* *May 19*, 340.
    2R.* *June 7*, 914.

Great Yarmouth Corporation Bill
c. 2R.* *May 31*, 421.

Greece
Trade Report presented, *May 19*, 308; *June 7*, 910.

Greene, Mr. H. D. [Shrewsbury]
Musical Copyright Bill, *Con.*, *June 10*, 1388, 1389, 1394.
Penal Servitude Bill, 2R., *June 3*, 732.

Greenwich Hospital
Age Pensions, Shortage in—Assimilating Naval to Army System.
Q. Sir C. Rasch; *A.* Mr. Pretyman *May 17*, 35–36.

Grenfell, Lord
Yeomanry—Development and efficiency of the Force, *May 19*, 316–317.

Grey, Earl
Crown Agents—Remuneration and method of transacting business — Inquiry proposed, *June 10*, 1338–1346, 1353.

Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. [Northumberland, Berwick]
Anglo-French Convention Bill, 2R., *June 1*, 516.
Congo Free State, Administration of, by the Belgian Government, Treatment of Natives, etc., *June 9*, 1285–1290.
Customs Department — Port, and Star Allowances, Information as to, *May 31*, 470.
Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *June 6*, 826, 827, 831, 893; *June 7*, 952.

Griffith, Mr. E. J. [Anglesey]
Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *June 6*, 813, 821, 826.

Groves, Mr. J. G. [Salford, S.]
Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *June 7*, 962.

Guiana, British
Ordinance 1891—Tabling Correspondence between Indian and Colonial Offices.
Q. Sir H. Fowler; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *May 18*, 178.
Copy Ordered, *May 19*, 342; Presented, *May 31*, 425.

Hague Arbitration Tribunal
Congo Free State—Administration of—Referring points in dispute to, proposed.
Os. Mr. Emmott, *June 9*, 1256; Mr. H. Samuel, 1265, 1266; Earl Percy, 1283.

Haldane, Rt. Hon. R. B. [Haddington]
Education (Scotland) Bill, *Com.*, *June 13*, 1527, 1587.
Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *June 6*, 826, 830, 865.
Penal Servitude Bill, 2R., *June 3*, 749.
Poor Law Medical Relief, Report of Departmental Committee on, *June 7*, 920.

Halsbury, Earl of—*Lord Chancellor.*
Land Act, Working of—Agitation and Intimidation by the United Irish League, *May 19*, 337.

Halsey, Mr. T. F. [Hertfordshire, Watford]
Education—Religious instruction in Voluntary schools — Church attendance during school hours, *June 9*, 1206.

Hamilton, Rt. Hon. Lord G. [Middlesex, Ealing]
Fiscal Policy—Taxation of Food, Attitude of the Government towards, *May 18*, 282.

Hampshire Regiment, 1st Battalion
Health of—Detention at Aden.
Q. Mr. J. Hutton; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *May 18*, 172.

Handsworth
Alteration in Polling District—Order presented, *June 6*, 776; *June 7*, 912.

Harborough
Parliamentary Election — New Writ, *June 6*, 807.

Harbours
See Piers and Harbours.

Harcourt Rt. Hon. Sir W. G. V. [Monmouthshire, W.]
Aliens Bill—Motion to Commit to Standing Committee on Law, *June* 8, 1121.
Finance Bill, 2R., *May 17*, 59.
Financial position of the country, growth of taxation, etc., *May 17*, 62–70.

Hardwicke, Earl of—*Under Secretary for India.*
Tibet Expedition, Progress of—Policy of H.M. Government, etc., *May 17*, 15–18.

Harlow and Sawbridgeworth Gas Bill.
c. 3R.* *May* 19, 338.
l. Commons' Amendments, *Con.* * *June 7*, 905.

Harris, Lord
Yeomanry.
Equipments, Training and Organisation of, *June 13*, 1443–46.
Establishment, Changes in, Proposed Reduction in strength of units, etc., *May 19*, 314–316.

Harwich
Harbour Conservancy Board, Receipts and Expenditure of—Accounts presented, *June 8*, 1045; *June 9*, 1185.

Harwood, Mr. G. [Bolton]
Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *June 7*, 998.
Musical Copyright Bill, *Con.*, *June 10* 1384, 1392, 1403.

Hastings
Post Office, Increased Salaries for Officials at.
Q. Mr. Freeman-Thomas; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 17*, 34.

Hay, Mr. C. G. D. [Shoreditch, Hoxton]
- Customs Inspection of Luggage at Dover and Newhaven, *May 31*, 439.
- Excise, Outdoor Officers of—Conditions of Service, Inquiry into, proposed, *May 31*, 479–481, 486.
- Housing of the Working Classes—Administration of Acts—Insanitary Areas, Returns as to—Granting of Loans—Re-housing Schemes, *June 2*, 653–654.
- Local Government Board—Progress made with re-organisation of, *June 2*, 654, 655.
- Vagrancy—Royal Commission of Inquiry into, Date of appointment of, *June 2*, 655.
- Vagrant Children, Control of, *June 2*, 653 655.

Haydon, Mr. J. P. [Roscommon, S.]
- Petty Sessions and Right of Appeal against Sentences — Assimilation of English and Irish law proposed, *June 13*, 1495.
- Roscommon — Imprisonment of County Councillor for Cruelty to Animals, *June 13*, 1494

Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir A. D. [Walsall]
- Vagrants — Establishment of Labour Colonies for, *June 2*, 656, 657.

Healy, Mr. T. M. [Louth, N.]
- Administration of Ireland Protests, against, *May 18*, 216–223.
- Ballinasloe Lunatic Asylum — Appointment of Dr. Kirwan, *May 19*, 367.
- Finance Bill, 2R., *May 18*, 216.
- Judges in Ireland, Proposed Reduction in number of, *May 18*, 216.

Heaton, Mr. J. H. [Canterbury]
- British North Borneo Company, Alleged illegal arrest by, *May 17*, 31–33.

Helme, Mr. N. W. [Lancashire, Lancaster]
- Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *June 7*, 991.

Hemphill, Rt. Hon. C. H. [Tyrone, M.]
- Dublin—Four Courts, Expediting Introduction of Electric Light into, *June 7*, 922.
- Finance Bill, 2R., *May 18*, 245.
- Land Act, Working of—Obstruction by Trinity College and the Landlords, *May 19*, 406, 407.
- Musical Copyright Bill, *Con.*, *June 10*, 1382, 1387, 1389.
- Penal Servitude Bill, 2R., *June 3*, 760.
- Taxation of Ireland—Protests against over-taxation, *May 18*, 245–247.

Henderson, Mr. A. [Durham, Barnard Castle]
- Chandler, Mr., Case of—Increased opportunities for learning Telegraph Work, proposed, *June 13*, 1470.
- Licensing Bill, *Com*,. *June 7*, 979.

Highlands and Islands of Scotland
- Deaths in, Large proportion of uncertificated.
  - *Os.* Mr. Weir, *May 19*, 418; Mr. A. G. Murray, 419.
- Lewis, Island of, *see that title.*
- Light Railways, Construction of.
  - *Os.* Mr. Weir, *June 2*, 710.
- Western Highlands, Arranging for Training Vessel to Visit.
  - *Q.* Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *June 7*, 922–923.

Hobhouse, Mr. C. E. H. [Bristol, E.]
- Aliens Bill—Expenses, Resolution as to, *June 8*, 1137, 1138.
- Army.
  - Army Corps—Report of Departmental Committee, *June 6*, 789.
  - Command Districts, Organisation of—Publishing Report of Departmental Committee, *June 8*, 1057.
  - Officers — Pay of General Officers Commanding-in-Chief, *June 8*, 1055.
- Lunatic Asylums, Granting Return showing Indebtedness of Counties and County Boroughs for Erection of, etc., *May 31*, 426–427.
- Thames River Steamboat Service Bill, *Con.*, *June 2*, 700.
- Transvaal Government Stores, Sale of, by Colonel Morgan, *June 8*, 1057.

Hobhouse, Rt. Hon. H. [Somersetshire, E.]
- Education.
  - Grant, Block, Effect of Change in, on Rural Schools, *May 19*, 362.
  - Pupil Teachers, Age of Admission as, Postponing Regulation fixing at sixteen, *June 6*, 782.
- Traction Engines, Damage done to Roads by, *June 2*, 638.

Holywood Tramways Bill
- *l.* 3R.* *May 17*, 2.
- *c.* 1R.* *May 17*, 27.
  - 2R.* *June 7*, 914.

Home Defence
- *see under* Defence of the Empire.

Home Industries Bill
- *c.* 2R.* Bill withdrawn, *June 8*, 1180.

Home Office
- *Secretary of State*—Mr. A. Akers Douglas.
- *Under-Secretary*—Mr. T. H. A. E. Cochrane.
- Papers of not sufficient value to justify preservation, List and particulars, presented, *June 6*, 777; *June 7*, 912.

Honduras, British
- Railway from Belize to the Hinterland—Obstructive attitude of Crown Agents.
  - *Os.* Earl of Portsmouth, *June 10*, 1328, 1329.

Hope, Mr. J. F. [Sheffield, Brightside]
Customs Department
Corn tax—Dismissal of staff engaged to levy, proposed, *May 31*, 443.
Examination of luggage at Dover, *May 31*, 443.
Officials of, objections to system of appointment by nomination, *May 31*, 443.
Navy—Battleships—Armour required for Ships of 1903 Programme—Date of issuing Tenders, *May 19*, 345.
Workmen's Compensation (Amendment) Bill—Date of Introduction, *May 31*, 427.

Hospitals
Dublin—Report of Board of Superintendence, with appendices for 1903-4, presented, *June 10*, 1327, 1368.

Houghton-le-Spring and District
Electric Lighting Order—Report presented, *June 9*, 1204; *June 10*, 1327.

Houldsworth, Sir W. H. [Manchester, N.W.]
Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *June 6*, 824, 827, 831, 842.

House of Commons
See under Parliament.

House of Lords
See under Parliament.

Housing of the Working Classes
Administration of Acts—Vesting sole power as to, in the Local Government Board, proposed.
O. Mr. C. Hay, *June 2*, 653, 667; Mr. Long, 667.
Insanitary Areas, Granting Returns as to, proposed,
O. Mr. C. Hay, *June 2*, 654.
Loans, Regulations as to granting of.
Os. Mr. C. Hay *June 2*, 654; Mr. Long, 667.
Local Government Board Official to deal exclusively with, Appointment of, proposed.
Os. Mr. C. Hay, *June 2*, 654; Mr. Long, 666.
Re-housing Schemes, Progress of.
O. Mr. C. Hay, *June 2*, 654.

Housing of the Working Classes (Rural Districts) Bill
c. 1R.* *May 17*, 48.

Hudson, Mr. G. B. [Hertfordshire, Hitchin]
London County Council (Tramways and Improvements) Bill, *Con. June 9*, 1307.

Humphreys-Owen, Mr. A. C. [Montgomery]
India—English Education, Political effect of, *June 9*, 1211.
Musical Copyright Bill, *Con.*, *June 10*, 1374, 1375.

Hunt, Mr. R. [Shropshire, Ludlow]
Astley Abbotts, Establishment of Post and Telegraph Office at, proposed, *June 9*, 1226.
Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *June 6*, 872
Schools, Public—use of Buildings for Political Meetings, *June 9*, 1227.
Transvaal—Importation of Chinese Labour—Provisions for Restriction to unskilled Labour, *June 13*, 1482.

Hurley Estate, Killarney
Sale of—Arrangements as to turbary rights.
Q. Mr. Murphy; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 13*, 1493.

Hutchinson, Dr. C. F. [Sussex, Rye]
Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *June 7*, 938.
Transvaal Mines—Rock Drilling—Making use of Water Jet compulsory, *May 17*, 38.

Hutton, Mr. J. [Yorkshire, Richmond]
Army—Hampshire Regiment 1st Battalion, Health of—Detention at Aden, *May 18*, 172.
Richmond Park, Removing dead Limbs and Branches from aged Oak Trees in, *June 6*, 781.
Vagrants, Difficulty of dealing with, *June 2*, 655.
Workhouses.
Imbeciles in, treatment of, *June 2*, 656.
Rural Districts, Condition in—Appointment of Committee of Inspection, Proposed, *June 2*, 656.

Ibibio Country
Military Patrol through — Reason for Attack on Natives.
Q. Mr. T. W. Russell; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *June 2*, 619-620.

Iceland
Telegraphic Communication between Faroe Isles, Great Britain and, Progress of.
Q. Mr. Doughty; *A.* Lord Stanley, *June 8*, 1069.

Iles de Los
Cession of, to France by Great Britain under the Arbitration Treaty.
Qs. Earl Percy, *June 1*, 500; Mr. J. Walton, 560.

Imperial Institute
Indian Contributions towards, and Benefits derived from.
Q. Sir M. Bhownaggree; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 7*, 923-924.

Imperial Yeomanry
see Yeomanry.

Income Tax

Abatements

Difficulty of recovering.
O. Mr. J. H. Lewis, *May 31*, 485.

House Property, Cost of Repairs to, allowing on.
Q. Mr. Field ; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *June 7*, 927.

Cape Four per Cent. Stock—Deductions from Dividends on account of Income Tax.
Os. Mr. Weir, *May 31*, 482, 487 ; Mr. V. Cavendish, 487.
Q. Mr. Weir ; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *June 7*, 928.

Collection, Method of, in England and in Scotland.
O. Mr. Ainsworth, *May 31*, 486.

Consol Certificates—Claims for Refundment of Past Years' Tax—Obliging Bank of England to supply Certificates of Deduction of Tax on Proof of Ownership.
Q. Mr. H. Samuel ; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *June 7*, 921.

Friendly Societies, Unregistered—Action of Inland Revenue Authorities in levying Income Tax on, etc.
Os. Mr. G. Whiteley, *May 31*, 473-476 ; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 476, 477, 479 ; Mr. Wallace, Mr. G. Bowles, 477 ; Sir E. Strachey, 478.

Increase in.
O. Mr. Robson, *May 17*, 105.

Ireland.

Decline in yield from, since 1893.
O. Mr. Clancy, *May 18*, 193, 194.

Salaries of Officials, Increase of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Nannetti ; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *June 13*, 1474.

Schoolmasters' Emoluments, Assessments under Schedule E on — Securing Uniformity in Payments.
Q. Col. Lockwood ; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *June 1*, 497.

India

Afghanistan, *see that title.*

Army.

Drafts for.

Cost of Transport per head.
Q. Sir J. Dickson-Poynder ; *A.* Mr. W. B. Davenport, *June 13*, 1481.

Number of men sent with less than one year of unexpired service.
Q. Sir J. Dickson-Poynder ; *A.* Mr. W. B. Davenport, *June 13*, 1481.

Officers, General—Filling Vacancies.
Q. Sir C. Rasch ; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *May 17*, 36.

India—*cont.*

Army—*cont.*

Organisation and training — Tabling Lord Kitchener's Memorandum, proposed.
Q. Sir H. Vincent ; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *May 19*, 350, 351.
Return ordered, *May 19*, 343 ; *June 3*, 772 ; Presented, *June 7*, 918.

Chitral, Administration of — Cost and number of persons employed.
Q. Mr. Schwann ; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 9*, 1221.

Competitive Examinations for Public Offices, Abolition of—Application of Rule to Natives—Patronage Regulations.
Q. Col. Nolan ; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 6*, 794–795.

Condition and Progress, Material and Moral—Statement for 1902–1903 presented, *May 31*, 425 ; *June 7*, 911.

Cotton growing in, Existence of Natural fertilisers in proximity to Land suitable for.
Q. Mr. Emmott ; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 3*, 718.
Return ordered, *June 7*, 918 ; Presented, *June 9*, 1204.

Dhar, Dewan of—Estate. Inquiry as to Restoration of Confiscated Portion of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Weir ; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 9*, 1211, 1212.

Dir, Administration of—Cost and number of persons employed.
Q. Mr. Schwann ; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 9*, 1221.

Education — Political Effect of English Education.
Q. Mr. Humphreys-Owen ; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 9*, 1211.

Finance—Statement for 1904-5 and Proceedings of Legislative Council.
Return ordered, *May 19*, 342 ; Presented, *June* 3, 717.

Governor-General, Vacation of Office of, by Absence from India—Acting Governor.
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill ; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 10*, 1372.

Imperial Institute, Contributions towards, and Benefits derived from.
Q. Sir M. Bhownaggree ; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 7*, 923–924.

Khyber, The, Administration of—Cost and number of persons employed.
Q. Mr. Schwann ; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June* 9, 1221.

Kurram, The, Administration of—Cost and number of persons employed.
Q. Mr. Schwann ; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 9*, 1221.

[*cont.*

India—*cont.*

North West Frontier — New Province, Administration of—Cost and number of persons employed.
Q. Mr. Schwann ; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 9*, 1221.

Official Secrets Bill—Points objected to, by Members of Select Committee.
Q. Mr. Weir ; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *May 19*, 350.

Police Report, Date of Tabling.
Q. Mr. Weir ; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *May 19*, 350.

Swat, Administration of—Cost and number of persons employed.
Q. Mr. Schwann ; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 9*, 1221.

Tea, Importation into Persia—Effect of Persian Duty, &c.
Q. Mr. G. Bowles ; *A.* Earl Percy, *June 13*, 1487, 1488.

Tibet Expedition, *see that title.*

Transvaal, British Indian Traders in—Boer Court Decisions Against, Upheld by Local Government – Action of Colonial Office, etc.
Qs. Sir M. Bhownaggree, Mr. G. Bowles ; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 19*, 357–358.

Waziristan, Administration of—Cost and Number of Persons Employed.
Q. Mr. Schwann ; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 9*, 1221.

Indian Councils Bill

c. 2R. *June 1*, 609.

Commerce and Industry, Appointment of Member for, proposed.
Os. Mr. Schwann, *June 1*, 609 ; Mr. Brodrick, 609, 610.

Expenditure under, in Additional Salaries, etc.
Q. Mr. Weir ; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 9*, 1210, 1211.

Public Works Department, Representation of.
Os. Mr. Brodrick, *June 1*, 610, 611 ; Mr. Caldwell, 610, Mr. C. Warner ; Mr. Lough, 612.

Indo-China, French

Trade Report Presented, *May 19*, 308.

Inland Revenue Department

Friendly Societies, Unregistered.

Position of, Payment of Income Tax by, etc.
Os. Mr. G. Whiteley, *May 31*, 473 – 475, 476 ; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 476, 477, 479 ; Mr. Wallace ; Mr. G. Bowles, 477 ; Sir E. Strachey, 478.

Outdoor Officers of Excise—Conditions of Service, Inquiry into, proposed.
Os. Mr. C. Hay, *May 31*, 479–481, 486 ; Mr. V. Cavendish, 484.

Ireland

Lord Lieutenant—Earl of Dudley.

Chief Secretary—Mr. George Wyndham.

Lord Chancellor—Lord Ashbourne.

Attorney-General—Mr. J. Atkinson.

Adams Estate, near Cork—Tenants' Refusal of Landlord's Terms of Sale—Individual Application for Re-Instatement.
Q. Mr. Flynn ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 19*, 344.

Administration of, Cost of, Compared with that of Great Britain.
Os. Mr. W. Churchill, *May 18*, 227, 228 ; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 238, 239.

Agriculture and Technical Instruction Department, *see that title.*

Animals, Diseases of—Report (1903), Presented, *May 31*, 426 ; *June 7*, 909.

Ardglass Herring Fishing Inquiry, Result of.
Q. Mr. MacVeagh ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 2*, 626.

Arklow—Report of Harbour Commissioners, Presented, *May 17*, 429.

Armagh Telegraph Office, Hours of Duty in.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale ; *A.* Lord Stanley, *June 2*, 619.

Arryheera, Donegal, Coastguard Station at, Cause of Delay in Erection of Buildings for.
Q. Mr. O'Doherty ; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *June 6*, 777–778.

Athlone—Agriculture and Technical Instruction, Minutes Presented, *June 6*, 775 ; *June 7*, 912.

Aughris, Sligo—Completion of Pier and Boatslip.
Q. Mr. W. McKillop ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 18*, 182.

Ballinasloe, *see that title.*

Ballyrankin Estate, Wexford — Sale of Interest of Three Tenants to adjoining Tenants—Sanction of Commissioners.
Q. Mr. W. Redmond ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 31*, 429–430.

Banks, *see under* Banks.

Bann River, Upper, laying down Trout from Loch Leven in.
Q. Mr. MacVeagh ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 3*, 719.

Bee-keeping — Foul Brood, Destruction of bees suffering from — Legislation proposed.
Q. Mr. Ffrench ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 13*, 1476, 1477.

Belfast — Valuation Appeals, Delay in hearing, proposed.
Qs. Mr. J. Devlin ; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 13*, 1496–1497.

Births, Deaths and Marriages—Report of Registrar-General (1891–1900) Presented, *May 31*, 424 ; *June 7*, 908.

[*cont.*

Ireland—*cont.*

Board of Trade Department in, establishment of, proposed.
O. Mr. Field, *May 18*, 248.

Buncrana Pier, Inadequacy of, Loss of Herrings caused by—Pier Extension.
Q. Mr. O'Doherty; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 19*, 343-344.

Cahir, opening Telephone Exchange at.
Q. Mr. Cullinan; *A.* Lord Stanley, *June 6*, 781.

Chief Secretary for—Limited power possessed by.
Os. Mr. T. M. Healy, *May 18*, 219-221; Colonel Saunderson, 243, 244.

Clones, Post Office, arrangement of new building.
Q. Mr. M'Kean; *A.* Lord Stanley, *June 9*, 1207.

Congested Districts Board, *see that title.*

Constabulary, *see* Constabulary, Royal Irish.

Coolrain, Telegraph Connection between Mountrath and, Cause of Delay in completing.
Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 18*, 164-165.

Cooscroum Landing Stage—Inadequacy of Improvement made by Congested Districts Board—Providing Proper Facilities.
O. Mr. Boland, *May 19*, 401.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 19*, 364-365.

Cork, *see that title.*

Cornahilta—School Teacher, promotion of.
Q. Mr. Jordan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 13*, 1492.

County Courts—Registrars, Salaries of, etc.—Return Presented, *May 31*, 426.

Customs Duties, incidence of—Appointment of Committee of Inquiry.
Os. Sir T. Esmonde; Mr. A. Chamberlain, *May 18*, 248.

Derrygonnelly, Insanitary Condition of, taking Immediate Steps to Remedy.
Q. Mr. E. Mitchell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 17*, 42.

Donegal, Landlords in, agreeing to sell under Land Act 1903—Valuation, Rents, etc., of Estates.
Q. Mr. O. Doherty; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 6*, 783-784.

Down, Number of Landlords and Tenants in—Names of Landlords agreeing to sell under Land Act, etc.
Q. Mr. Macveagh; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 6*, 801.

Drogheda Mortuary, Body left for two Months in—Authority responsible for Neglect, etc.
Q. Mr. W. Moore; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 8*, 1054.

Ireland—*cont.*

Drunkenness, Arrests for, from 1 May, 1903 to 30 Apr. 1904.
Return Ordered *May 19*, 342; Presented, *June 13*, 1465.

Dublin, *see that title.*

Dungannon Disturbances — Action of Constabulary.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 18*, 182-183.

Education, *see under* Education.

Emigration and Immigration, *see that title.*

Ennis Postmastership—Date of becoming Vacant—Advertising in Post Office Circular.
Q. Mr. Nannetti; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 19*, 349.

Erne, Lough—Drainage Charges—Inclusion in Inquiry as to Trinity College Rents, proposed.
Q. Mr. T. W. Russell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 13*, 1492, 1493.

Evictions, *see that title.*

Financial Autonomy subject to Fixed Contribution to Imperial Exchequer, proposed.
Os. Mr. Waldron, *May 18*, 205, 206; Mr. Lough, 211; Mr. T. W. Russell, 215; Mr. T. M. Healy, 216, 217; Mr. W. Churchill, 229; Sir T. Esmonde, 247.

Fisheries, *see under* Fisheries.

Fitzgerald Estate, Mayo—Securing Grazing Lands for Congested Areas.
Q. Dr. Ambrose; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 18*, 170.

Fitzwilliam Estate, Ejectment Processes Served to Tenants of — Accepting Landlord's Terms of Sale, etc.
Qs. Mr. J. O'Connor, Mr. T. W. Russell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 2*, 624-625.
Q. Mr. J. O'Connor; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 6*, 808.

Galway, *see that title.*

Hurley Estate, Sale of—Arrangements as to Turbary rights.
Q. Mr. Murphy; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 13*, 1493.

Income Tax.
Decline in yield from, since 1893.
O. Mr. Clancy, *May 18*, 193, 194.
Salaries of Officials, Increase of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Nannetti; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *June 13*, 1474.

Industries of, Loans from Congested Districts Board and Agricultural Department in aid of, etc.
Q. Mr. Brigg; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 3*, 719-720.

Judges, reduction in number of, proposed.
O. Mr. T. M. Healy, *May 18*, 216.

Ireland—*cont.*

Kenmare River, Illegal trawling by French boats in—Steps taken to protect local fishermen, etc.
Qs. Mr. Boland, Mr. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 9*, 1228, 1229.

Kerry, *see that title.*

Kilbride Camp Canteen License, Order for, signed by Two Magistrates in opposition to their Colleagues, validity of, etc.
Q. Mr. J. O'Connor; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 2*, 625–626.
Qs. Mr. J. O'Connor, Mr. Cullinan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 6*, 802.

Kilcoo, Down, Delay in Delivery of Letters at, taking steps to prevent.
Q. Mr. Macveagh; *A.* Lord Stanley, *June 2*, 627.

Killorglin, evicted Tenant at, securing reinstatement of.
Q. Mr. Murphy; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 19*, 365.

Kingston Estate—Dispute as to Terms of Sale — Bringing the Matter under Notice of Estates Commissioners.
Q. Mr. W. Abraham; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 19*, 363–364.

Kingstown—West Pier—Treasury minute authorising lease of premises, Presented, *June 7*, 918; *June 9*, 1184.

Labourers' Cottages, *see that title.*

Land Act, *see that title.*

Land Commission, *see that title.*

Land Purchase, *see that title.*

Law Officers, High Salaries paid to.
O. Mr. W. Churchill, *May 18*, 227, 228.

Listowel and Tarbet Coach Service—Contract Price — Inviting Local Tenders.
Q. Mr. Flavin; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, Mr. Speaker, *May 17*, 45–46.
Q. Mr. Flavin; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 19*, 365–366.

Local Government Board, *see that title.*

Loch Leven, Trout from, laying down, in Upper Bann River.
Q. Mr. Macveagh; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 3*, 719.

Londonderry, Inspection of luggage at—Inconvenience of Custom House arrangements.
O. Mr. C. Devlin, *May 31*, 445.

Longford Estate, Westmeath, Arrangements for Sale of—Application of A. Caddell for Re-instatement.
Q. Mr. Sullivan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 6*, 801.

Longworth Estate, Galway, Purchase of, by Congested Districts Board — Enlarging adjoining Holdings.
Q. Mr. Roche; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 17*, 31-32.

Lough Erne Drainage Charges—Inclusion in Inquiry as to Trinity College Rents, proposed.
Q. Mr. T. W. Russell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 13*, 1492–1493.

Motor Car Services, Establishment of, Granting Local Authorities Power to levy Rate for, Introducing Bill for.
Q. Mr. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 2*, 626–627.

Mountrath, Queen's County, Telegraph connection between Coolrain and, Cause of Delay in completing.
Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 18*, 164–165.

National School Teachers, *see that title.*

Nenagh, Tipperary, Extending Telephone Service at.
Qs. Mr. P. J. O'Brien; *As.* Lord Stanley, *June 8*, 1050; *June 13*, 1471.

Omagh Post Office, Duty of arranging Overtime at.
Q. Mr. Joyce; *A.* Lord Stanley, *June 7*, 932.

Pauperism, Increase in, due to overtaxation.
Os. Mr. Clancy, *May 18*, 192; Mr. Lough, 210; Mr. T. W. Russell, 212.

Petty Sessions and the Right of Appeal from Sentences — Assimilation of English and Irish Law, proposed.
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 13*, 1477-1478.
Q. Mr. Hayden; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 13*, 1495.

Piers and Harbours, *see that title.*

Police, *see titles* Constabulary, Royal Irish, *and* Dublin—Metropolitan Police.

Poor Law—Outdoor Relief Regulations.
Q. Mr. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 9*, 1228.

Poverty-Stricken Condition of the People, References to, in Debate on the Finance Bill, *May 18*, 200, 224, 232.

Public Buildings—Insurance against Fire.
Qs. Mr. Murnaghan, Mr. J. O'Connor; *As.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *June 13*, 1501.

Public Trustee, Opening of Office of—Appointing Assistants.
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 19*, 351.

Quit and Crown Rents, Redemption of—Terms under Ashbourne and Land Acts of 1896 and 1903.
Q. Mr. Gilhooly; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 18*, 183.

Railways, *see under* Railways.

[*cont.*

Ireland—*cont.*
Regiments in—Kilbride Camp Canteen Licence, Order for, Signed by Two Magistrates in Opposition to their Colleagues, Validity of, etc.
Q. Mr. J. O'Connor; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 2*, 625-626.
Qs. Mr. J. O'Connor, Mr. Cullinan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 6*, 802.
Representative Peers for—Viscount de Vesci, Right of, to Vote at Elections, established, *June 10*, 1417.
Roscommon—Imprisonment of County Councillor for Cruelty to Animals.
Q. Mr. Hayden; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 13*, 1494, 1495.
Tarbet and Listowel Coach Service—Contract Price—Inviting Local Tenders, etc.
Q. Mr. Flavin; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, Mr. Speaker, *May 17*, 45–46.
Q. Mr. Flavin; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 19*, 365–366.
Taxation, *see that title.*
Tea, Additional duty of 2d. per pound on—Hardships inflicted on the poor by the tax, References to, in debate on the Finance Bill, *May 18*, 189, 236.
Teenan Estate, Evictions on—Enabling Tenants to purchase Holdings.
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 10*, 1370-1371.
Telegraph Service, *see that title.*
Telephone Service, *see that title.*
Tithe Rents, Redemption of—Terms under Ashbourne and Land Acts of 1896 and 1903.
Q. Mr. Gilhooly; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 18*, 183.
Tralee and Dingle Railway, Negotiations as to—Submitting Terms of Agreement to the House.
Qs. Mr. Field, Mr. Nannetti, Mr. Murphy; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 7*, 929–930.
Trawling, Illegal, in Kenmare River—Steps taken to Protect Local Fishermen.
Qs. Mr. Boland; Mr. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 9*, 1228, 1229.
United Irish League, *see that title.*
Valentia—Ferry, Provision of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 9*, 1227.
Waggons, Loaded—Regulation as to width of Tyre, Alteration of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Ffrench; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 13*, 1476.
Warden Estate—Evicted tenants, Applications received from, for re-instatement.
Qs. Mr. Boland; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 13*, 1493, 1494.
Whisky, Manufacture of, from Impure Materials—Government Protection of Growers of Cereals, proposed.
Q. Mr. Ffrench; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 13*, 1477.

Irish Guards
Athletic Sports, Public, at Lea Bridge, Admission to, refused to Non-commissioned Officers in Uniform.
Qs. Sir C. Rasch, Gen. Laurie, Mr. MacVeagh, Mr. Cullinan; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *June 6*, 687–788.

Irish Society
Londonderry Estates of, Sale of—Taking Precautions to carry out Objects of the Trust, etc.
Qs. Mr. O'Doherty, Mr. T. W. Russell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 7*, 930-931.

Italy
Industrial Development—Report presented, *June 7*, 908.
Maltese Trade, Value of, in each Year 1898-1902.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour *May 31*, 431.

Jacoby, Mr. J. A. [Derbyshire, Mid.]
Congo Free State—Establishing Consular Court for Protection of British Residents, *May 19*, 350.

Jameson, Major J. E. [Clare, W.]
Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *June 6*, 870.
Post Office—Gratuities for Officials not entitled to Pensions—Amount to be Distributed in Ireland, *May 31*, 429.

Japan
Army, Cost of, per year since 1899.
Q. Mr. Trevelyan; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *June 13*, 1478.
Columbia, British, Provincial Immigration Act, 1904, of, Protest as to, etc.
Q. Mr. C. Devlin; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *June 8*, 1061.
War with Russia, *see* Russo-Japanese War.

Java
Trade Report Presented, *June 7*, 910.

Jersey
Frenchwoman banished from—Repatriation *viâ* England—Effect of Sentence.
Q. Mr. Bayley; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *May 18*, 163.

Jessel, Capt. H. M. [St. Pancras, S.]
London County Council (Tramways and Improvements) Bill, *Con.*, *June 9*, 1298, 1305.
Thames River Steamboat Service Bill, *Con.*, *June 2*, 701.
Westminster Bridge Tramway Terminus, Removal of, *May 31*, 427.

Jews
East Africa, Settlement in—Appointing Independent Commission of Inquiry.
Os. Mr. C. Wason, *June 9*, 1294–1296; Earl Percy, 1295, 1296.
Qs. Mr. C. Wason; *As.* Earl Percy, *May 17*, 39; *June 9*, 1222.

Johnstone, Mr. J. H. [Sussex, Horsham]
Fiscal Policy—Free Food Debate, May 18, affording Facilities for Resumption of, *June 1*, 498.

Jones, Mr. W. [Carnarvonshire, Arfon]
Oxford Telegraph Office—Compelling Staff to perform Postal Duties, *June 6*, 780.

Jordan, Mr. J. [Fermanagh, S.]
Cornahilta School teacher, Promotion of, *June 13*, 1492.

Joyce, Mr. M. [Limerick]
Fisheries—Granting Return showing Opening and Closing Dates for Rod and Line Fishing, *May 17*, 45.
Omagh Post Office, Duty of arranging Overtime at, *June 7*, 932.
"Turbo"—Trial of Chinese Seamen for desertion, *June 9*, 1208.

Judicature and Development Grant (Ireland) Bill
c. 1R.* *May 19*, 368.

Juvenile Offenders
Cases, hearing of—Separating Juvenile from Adult Offenders.
Q. Mr. Talbot; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *May 18*, 163-164.

Kabul
British Mission to—Information as to sending.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr Brodrick, *June 9*, 1220, 1221.

Kearley, Mr. H. E. [Devonport]
Division challenged frivolously—Precedent for claiming irrespective of numbers, *June 2*, 709.
Finance Bill, 2R. *May 17*, 111.
Milk, Adulteration of—Slackness of Local Authorities and Local Government Board, *June 2*, 669-672, 674.
Taxation, increase in, effect of, on trade of the Country, *May 17*, 111, 112.

Kenmare River
Trawling, illegal, in, by French boats—Steps taken to protect local fishermen.
Qs. Mr. Boland, Mr. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 9*, 1228, 1229.

Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir J. H. [Devonshire, Honiton]
Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *June 6*, 840.
Torbay, Heavy Gun Firing off, taking Steps to minimise annoyance caused by, *June 6*, 777.

Kensington Gardens
Fountains in, Reason for Stoppage of.
Q. Mr. Coghill; *A.* Lord Balcarres, *May 17*, 33-34.
Sand Ride in, proposed.
Q. Lord Cecil Manners; *A.* Lord Balcarres, *June 8*, 1050.

Kerry
Congested Divisions in North Kerry, Number of—Expenditure by the Board on Fisheries, 1897-1903.
Q. Mr. Flavin; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 17*, 44.
Fisheries of North Kerry—Applications for Improved Facilities from Beale and Gullane—Action of Congested Districts Board.
Q. Mr. Flavin; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 19*, 366.
Landlords agreeing to sell Estates in—Number, Names, Valuation, Rentals, etc.
Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 17*, 32.

Khyber, The
Administration, Cost of, etc.
Q. Mr. Schwann; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 9*, 1221.

Kilbride
Camp—Canteen License, Order for, signed by two Magistrates in Opposition to their Colleagues, Validity of, etc.
Q. Mr. J. O'Connor; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 2*, 625-626.
Qs. Mr. J. O'Connor, Mr. Cullinan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 6*, 802.

Kilcoo, Down
Letters, Delay in Delivery of, taking Steps to prevent.
Q. Mr. MacVeagh; *A.* Lord Stanley, *June 2*, 627.

Killorglin
Evicted Tenant at, securing Re-instatement of.
Q. Mr. Murphy; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 19*, 365.

Kilpatrick
Electric Lighting Order—Report, presented, *June 9*, 1205; *June 10*, 1327.

Kimber, Sir H. [Wandsworth]
Post Office—London Sorter Tracers, answering Memorial from, as to Pay and Promotion, *June 6*, 781.

King's College Hospital Bill
l. Report from Select Committee, *June 10*, 1325.

Kingston Estate
Terms of Sale, Dispute as to—Bringing the Matter under Notice of Estates Commissioners.
Q. Mr. W. Abraham; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 19*, 363-364.

Kingstown, Ireland
West Pier—Treasury Minute authorising lease of premises, presented, *June 7*, 018; *June 9*, 1184.

Kingswood
Electric Lighting Order — Report, presented, *June 9*, 1205 ; *June 10*, 1327.

Kirkby-in-Ashfield Urban District Gas Bill
l. 3R.* *June 9*, 1182.

Kurram, The
Administration, Cost of, etc.
Q. Mr. Schwann ; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 9*, 1221.

Labouchere, Mr. H. [Northampton]
Aliens Bill—Motion to Commit to Standing Committee on Law, *June 8*, 1123.

Labourers' Cottages (Ireland)
Loans, Terms of Granting, Onerous Nature of, alleged.
Q. Mr. Clancy ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 9*, 1212.
Number of, Amount of Loans sanctioned and received, etc.
Return Presented, *May 31*, 426 ; *June 1*, 493.

Labourers (Ireland) Bill
Date of Second Reading.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale ; *A.* Mr. Atkinson, *June 8*, 1076.
Q. Mr. J. Redmond ; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 8*, 1077–1078.

Lagos
Revenue and Expenditure, and Trade, from 1900 — Statement Presented, *June 6*, 775 ; *June 7*, 910.

Lambert, Mr. G. [Devonshire, South Molton]
Defence of the Empire—Home Defence, Force to be maintained for, *June 6*, 805.
Somaliland Campaign—Cost, total, Prior to 1st October, 1902, *June 8*, 1048.
Tibet Expedition.
Discussion, Allowing Opportunity for, *May 18*, 184.
Lhasa, Advance to, Date fixed for—Russian Influence on Negotiation, *June 6*, 793–794.
Volunteers, Training of—Cost, Additional Annual, to the State by Providing out-of-pocket Expenditure of Volunteers, *June 6*, 789.

Lambeth
Vaccination Prosecutions—Solicitor, Employment of, by Vaccination Officer.
Q. Mr. Corrie Grant ; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *June 9*, 1210.

Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway (Various Powers) Bill
l. 1R.* *May 17*, 2.
2R.* *June 13*, 1418.

Land Act, Ireland, 1903
Head rents and Tithe rent charge, relative values of.
Os. Mr. Wyndham, *May 19*, 403.
Proceedings under, for six months ended April 30, 1904.
Return Presented, *May 19*, 341.
Suspension of, in districts where intimidation prevails, proposed.
Os. Lord Clonbrock, *June 13*, 1423, 1424 ; Lord Ashbourne, 1428 ; Earl of Westmeath, 1431 ; Marquess of Lansdowne, 1434, 1435.
Voluntary character of.
Os. Lord Ashbourne, *June 13*, 1427 ; Marquess of Lansdowne, 1433.
Working of.
Agitation and Intimidation by the United Irish League — Steps taken to prevent, etc.
Os. Earl of Westmeath, *May 19*, 330–334 ; Lord Clonbrock, 334, 335 ; Earl of Denbigh, 336 ; Lord Clonbrock, *June 13*, 1419, 1423, 1424 ; Lord Barrymore, 1425, 1426 ; Lord Ashbourne, 1427, 1428 ; Lord Oranmore and Browne, 1431 ; Earl of Arran, 1432 ; Marquess of Lansdowne 1433, 1434.
Obstruction by Trinity College and the Landlords, alleged.
Os. Mr. T. W. Russell, *May 19*, 399, 400 ; Mr. Boland, 401 ; Mr. Flavin, 401, 402 ; Mr. Wyndham, 402–404 ; Mr. T. P. O'Connor, 404–406 ; Mr. Hemphill, 406, 407.

Land Commission, Ireland
Proceedings during January, 1904—Return presented, *May 31*, 424 ; *June 7*, 908.

Land Drainage Provisional Order Bill
l. 1R.* *June 7*, 906.

Land Drainage Provisional Order (Owston and West Butterwick in County of Lincoln (Parts of Lindsey) Bill
c. 2R.* *May 17*, 23.
Rep.* *June 2*, 615.
3R.* *June 3*, 713.

Land (Ireland) Bill
Date of Second Reading, etc.
Q. Mr. J. Redmond ; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 8*, 1077–1078.

Land Judge's Court, Ireland
Estates over which Receivers have been appointed.
Return presented, *May 19*, 342.

Land Purchase, Ireland
Adams Estate, near Millstreet, Cork—Tenants' Refusal of Landlord's Terms—Individual Application for Re-instatement.
Q. Mr. Flynn ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 19*, 344.

[*cont*

Land Purchase, Ireland—*cont.*

Ballyrankin Estate, Wexford—Sale of Interest of Three Tenants to adjoining Tenant—Sanction of Commissioners.
Q. Mr. W. Redmond; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 31*, 429–430.

Bank of Ireland, Estimate of Balances in, under Act of 1903—Arrangements as to Interest.
Q. Mr. W. Abraham; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *June 1*, 496–497.

Banking Arrangements as to Act of 1903, Dissatisfaction of Joint Stock Banks with—Allowing Opportunity for Discussion.
Q. Mr. J. Redmond; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *June 7*, 931–932.

Donegal—Names of Landlords agreeing to sell—Valuation, Rents, etc., of Estates.
Q. Mr. O'Doherty; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 6*, 783–784.

Down, County, Number of Landlords and Tenants in—Names of Landlords agreeing to Sell, etc.
Q. Mr. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 6*, 801.

Education Commissioners' Estates—Granting Return showing Rentals, Receipts and Expenses, etc.
Q. Mr. Murphy; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 17*, 42–43.

Fitzgerald Estate, Mayo—Sale of Grazing Farms by Private Treaty—Securing Grazing Land for Benefit of Congested Areas.
Q. Dr. Ambrose; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 18*, 170; *June 7*, 921–922.

Fitzwilliam, Earl, Ejectment Processes served to Tenants of—Accepting Landlord's Terms of Sale, etc.
Qs. Mr. J. O'Connor, Mr. T. W. Russell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 2*, 624–625.
Q. Mr. J. O'Connor; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 6*, 803.

Hurley Estate, Killarney—Arrangements as to Turbary Rights.
Q. Mr. Murphy; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 13*, 1493.

Kerry, Landlords agreeing to sell in—Number, Names, Valuation, Rentals, etc.
Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 17*, 32.

Kingston Estate—Dispute as to Terms of Sale—Bringing the Matter to Notice of Commissioners, etc.
Q. Mr. W. Abraham; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 19*, 363–364.

Lloyd-Apjohn Estate, Limerick—Progress of Sale.
Q. Mr. Lundon; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 17*, 43.

Land Purchase, Ireland—*cont.*

Longford Estate, Westmeath, Arrangements for Sale of—Application of A. Caddell for Re-instatement.
Q. Mr. Sullivan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 6*, 801.

Longworth Estate, Galway, Purchase of, by Congested Districts Board—Enlarging Adjoining Holdings.
Q. Mr. Roche; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 17*, 31–32.

Rents, Refusal of Tenants to Pay—Action of the United Irish League, etc.
Os. Lord Clonbrook, *June 13*, 1420; Lord Barrymore, 1425, 1426; Lord Ashbourne, 1427; Earl of Westmeath, 1430.

United Irish League, Agitation and Intimidation by—Steps taken to prevent.
Os. Earl of Westmeath, *May 19*, 332, 333; Lord Clonbrock, 335; Earl of Denbigh, 336; Lord Clonbrock, *June 13*, 1419, 1420, 1421, 1423; Lord Barrymore, 1425, 1426; Lord Ashbourne, 1427, 1428; Lord Oranmore and Browne, 1431; Earl of Arran, 1432; Marquess of Lansdowne, 1433, 1434.

Land Tax Commissioners Name Bill

Date of Introduction.
Q. Mr. J. H. Lewis; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *May 31*, 485, 486.

Lansdowne, Marquess of—*Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs*

Coasting Trade.
Philippine Islands, Application of Coast-wise Laws of the United States to, *June 13*, 1458, 1459.
Practice of other Maritime Countries in Reserving to Vessels of their own Nationality, *June 13*, 1456, 1457, 1458.

Cotton, Declaration of, as Contraband of War by Russian Government, *May 17*, 12; *May 19*, 309.

Land Act (Ireland), Working of—Agitation and Intimidation by the United Irish League, etc., *June 13*, 1433–1435.

Salisbury, Marquess of—Erection of Monument to, proposed, *May 17*, 5.

Tibet Expedition, Progress of—Policy of H.M. Government, etc., *May 17*, 20–22.

Yeomanry Establishment, Changes in—Reduction in Strength of Units, etc., *May 19*, 328–330.

Laurie, Lieut.-Gen. J. W. [Pembroke and Haverfordwest]

Army—Irish Guards—Refusal to Admit Non-Commissioned Officers in Uniform to Public Sports, Lea Bridge, *June 6*, 788.

Law Courts

Perjury in, Taking Steps to Suppress.
Q. Mr. B. Roberts; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *May 19*, 359.

Law Officers of the Crown
Ireland—High Salaries Paid to Officials.
O. Mr. W. Churchill, *May 18*, 227, 228.

Lawrence, Sir J. [Monmouth Boroughs]
Education Board Provisional Orders (Cardiff and Newport Monmouthshire) Bill, 2R., *June 13*, 1572.

Lawrence, Mr. W. F. [Liverpool, Abercromby]
Education—Church Attendance of Children in School Hours, Powers of Managers to compel, etc., *May 18*, 181.
Shop Hours Bill, 2R., *June 1*, 581.

Lawson, Mr. J. G.—*Secretary to the Local Government Board* [York, N.R., Thirsk]
Milk.
Adulteration of, Steps taken to Check, *June 2*, 673, 674.
Epidemics due to—Inspection of Cows by Veterinary Surgeons proposed, *June 13*, 1489.
Motor Cars — Departmental Committee Recommendations — Consideration of County Council representations, proposed, *June 13*, 1490.
Poor Law Expenditure—Omissions from Return of Inspection, *June 13*, 1490.
Vaccination— Forms for Distribution to Parents, Preparation of, by Local Government Board, suggested, etc. *June 2*, 624.

Lee, Mr. A. H. [Hampshire, Fareham]
Malta Dockyard Extension—Date of completing Work, *June 8*, 1057.
Pensions, Special, Cases of non-Award to Applicants over Sixty-Five of Good Character, etc.—Case of Mr. Fife, *June 6*, 787.

Leese, Sir J. F. [Lancashire, Accrington]
Penal Servitude Bill, 2R., *June 3*, 738.
Thames River Steamboat Service Bill, *Con.*, *June 2*, 688-690.

Leeward Islands
Report, Annual, presented, *June 2*, 618; *June 7*, 908.

Leicester
Parliamentary Election for South or Harborough Division—New Writ, *June 6*, 807.

Leicestershire and Warwickshire Electric Power Bill
c. 2R.* *May 31*, 421.

Leith
Educational Area for, providing Uniform Bursary System over Edinburgh and.
Q. Mr. M. Ferguson; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *June 6*, 782–783.

Leith Burgh Order Confirmation Bill
c. 1R.* *June 1*, 490.
2R.* *June 9*, 1201.
*Con.** *June 13*, 1461.

Leith Corporation Tramways Order Confirmation Bill
c. 1R.* *June 1*, 489.
2R.* *June 9*, 1202.

Leng, Sir J. [Dundee]
Admiralty Buildings, Old, Reasons for pulling down Part — Erecting New Government Office on Site, *May 17*, 41.
Government Stock—Unclaimed Dividends —Suggested Publication of Annual Alphabetical List of Dividends, *May 18*, 179.
Post Office—Provincial Offices, Want of Vacancies for qualified Female Learners in, *June 7*, 928.
Navy—Salvage Work—Employment of British firms, proposed, *June 13*, 1469.
"Thistle" Launch—Cause of Sinking—Salvage operations, etc., *June 9*, 1213.

Letters
See under Post Office.

Levy, Mr. M. [Leicestershire, Loughborough]
Aliens Bill—Expenses, Resolution as to, *June 8*, 1143, 1145.

Lewis, Island of
Lochs, providing Grant for Construction of Footpaths in Districts of.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *May 19*, 362–363.

Lewis, Mr. J. H. [Flint Boroughs]
Customs Department Boatmen—System of appointment, objections to, *May 31*, 447.
Income Tax Abatements, Difficulty of recovering, *May 31*, 485.
Land Tax Commissioners Name Bill—Date of Introduction, *May 31*, 485.
Licensing Bill.
Committee Stage, date of taking, *May 19*, 419.
Com. June 7, 1030.

Leyton Urban District Council Bill
c Report from Police and Sanitary Committee, *June 10*, 1365.

Licences
Dog.
Fines, Amount received in, from people neglecting to take out.
Os. Mr. Weir, *May 31*, 481, 487; Mr. V. Cavendish, 487.
Prosecutions, Statistics of, for 1903 and 1904—Fines.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *June 8*, 1073 1074.

Licensing Bill
- Committee Stage—Date of taking.
  - *Q.* Mr. J. H. Lewis; *A.* Sir A. Acland-Hood, *19 May*, 419, 420.
- *c Com.*, *June 6*, 809; *June 7*, 934; *June 8*, 1173.
- *Debates on Committee* [Commons], *June 6*, 809; *June 7*, 934; *June 8*, 1173.
  - Ante-1869 Beerhouses.
    - Position of, 938, 1018.
    - Time limit proposals, effect of, on, 836, 852, 853, 892, 893, 935.
  - Brewers.
    - New Licences, refusal of, to, proposed, 873.
    - Pressure brought to bear on the Government by, 960, 962, 970, 980, 1002, 1006–1008, 1014, 1022.
    - Profits of, 858.
  - Bruce, Mr., Bill of, in 1874, 954, 955, 968.
  - Clause 1.
    - Consulting Magistrates of Quarter Sessions as to, proposed, 814.
    - Postponement of, proposed, 809–818.
  - Compensation.
    - Amount to be Awarded, and number of years purchase, Method of fixing, 874.
    - Area of—Changes in Jurisdiction of Local Justices, etc., 809, 810, 815, 982, 988.
    - Authority to impose contributions, 809, 810, 981, 982.
    - Conditions to regulate fund, 815.
    - Fund to become a private fund to be administered by a board after 31 Dec. 1904—Introduction of new clause proposed, 900–902.
    - Insurance Fund to be raised by the Trade, 840, 842, 847, 857, 861, 863, 864, 883, 897, 937–939, 942, 950, 954, 966, 992.
    - Licences taken away through no fault of owner—Compensation to be granted, 812, 816, 852, 861, 871, 883, 884, 957, 977, 989, 1023.
    - Limited or unlimited levy, question as to, 810, 811, 973.
    - National, rather than local, levy, proposed, 855.
    - Number of reductions which could be effected by, 891, 892, 897, 937, 972, 974, 981, 986, 1010.
    - On-and-off licences, jurisdiction as to, 1174–1177, 1180.
    - "Right" of licence-holders to, 851, 859, 862, 874, 881, 898, 904, 949, 964, 967–969, 995, 1003.

Licensing Bill—*cont.*
- *Debates on Committee, &c.—cont.*
  - Compensation—*cont.*
    - Time limit, adoption of, proposed, 811, 813–816, 818, 821, 823, 830, 832–842, 844–846, 848, 855, 857, 860, 862, 863, 869, 871–873, 875–881, 883, 885, 887, 888, 890, 892–895, 899, 935, 936, 946, 949, 963, 966, 974, 976, 978, 979, 985–987, 991, 992, 994, 998, 999, 1001–1004, 1007, 1012.
      - Ante-1869 Beerhouses, position of, under, 836, 852, 853, 892, 893, 935.
      - Clergy, Opinion of, as to, 832, 833, 959.
      - Compensation fund, impossibility of raising without a perpetuity tenure, 863–865, 897.
      - Discussion of, on Amendment to Clause 1, discussion on Clause 2 precluded by—Withdrawal of Amendment, proposed, 824–832, 844, 845.
      - Fourteen years proposed, 848, 849, 862, 870, 871, 890, 987, 1005, 1016, 1019.
      - Majority Report in favour of, alleged, 839, 946.
      - Seven years proposed, 821, 823–825, 844.
      - Working of—Impossible nature of proposal, 833–837, 840, 842, 847, 852, 951, 969, 971, 987, 995, 1019.
  - Drunkenness, Reduction of, not Guaranteed by reduction in Licences, 936, 940.
  - Licences.
    - Beer Off-licences, bringing, under the Bill, proposed, 1175, 1177.
    - Increase in Number of, alleged, 962, 986.
    - Insurance of, possibility of, 941, 955, 956, 962.
    - Issue of, at Full Market Value, proposed, 854, 858, 859, 868, 946.
    - New.
      - Conditions of granting, 974, 1018.
      - Refusal of, to Brewers, proposed, 873.
    - On and Off-licences, Jurisdiction as to refusal and granting of, 1174, 1175, 1178–1180.
    - Reduction of, Degree of, possible by the Compensation Fund, 891, 892, 897, 937, 972, 974, 981, 986, 1010.

[*cont.*

Licensing Bill—*cont.*
- *Debate on Committee, &c.—cont.*
  - Licences—*cont.*
    - Refusal of.
      - Direction of Magistrates as to, 851, 867, 886, 887, 889, 890, 943, 984, 992, 996.
      - Hardships Inflicted by Decisions of Magistrates, 965, 997, 1004.
      - On and Off-licences, Jurisdiction as to, 1174, 1175, 1178–1180.
    - Security of Tenure, 822, 880, 944, 946, 947, 956, 957, 976, 981, 1011.
    - Temporary Nature of, 849, 850, 855, 869, 886, 940, 949, 950, 968.
    - Value of, for the whole Country, 944, 975.
      - Enhanced Value Conferred on, by the Bill, 944, 945, 947, 967, 968, 971, 973, 974, 976, 990, 1000.
      - Property Value of, 822, 846, 847, 850, 940, 987, 1017, 1022.
    - Vested Interest of a Freehold Character, alleged, 842–844, 846, 849, 859-861, 875, 877, 882, 888, 898, 903, 904, 934, 944, 945, 949, 950, 956–958, 978, 1016, 1022, 1023.
  - Liquor, Additional Taxation on, proposed, 855.
  - Local Veto impossible under the Bill, 856, 857, 868, 871, 946, 952, 953.
  - Motives for introduction of the Bill, 961, 970, 989, 1002, 1006–1008, 1014, 1015.
  - Quarter Sessions, Consulting Magistrates of, as to Clause 1, proposed, 814.
  - Re-consideration of whole scheme, proposed, 841.
  - Reform, Further, barred by, alleged, 843, 856, 857, 866, 889, 890, 894, 896–899, 945, 952, 957, 959, 962, 970, 972, 976, 977, 979, 980, 982, 997, 998, 1018, 1020.
  - Temperance Interests not consulted, alleged, 869, 878, 935, 960, 965, 967, 977, 1009, 1011, 1021.
  - Tied Houses, Proposals as to, 880.
  - Time Limit, *see under subheading* Compensation.
- Compensation — Tied Houses—Granting Power to Committee to differentiate amount and mode of Compensation—Instruction to Committee.
  - *O.* Mr. Speaker, *June* 6, 809.

Licensing Bill--*cont.*
- Consideration, Date of.
  - *Qs.* Mr. MacVeagh; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June* 9, 1233.
- Division of, into two Bills—Instruction to Committee.
  - *O.* Mr. Speaker, *June* 6, 808.
- Licences.
  - Issue of, Restrictions on—Instruction to Committee.
    - *O.* Mr. Speaker, *June* 6, 809.
  - Number of, and Amount of Compensation Payable under the Bill in England and Wales.
    - Return ordered, *June* 1, 494; Presented, *June* 2, 618.
- Time Limit Amendment, Bill converted into a temporary Act by, Contrary to Standing Orders.
  - *Os.* Mr. Lloyd-George, Mr. J. W. Lowther, 1029, 1030; Mr. J. H. Lewis, 1030.
- Wales and Monmouthshire, exclusion of, from the Bill—Instruction to Committee.
  - *O.* Mr. Speaker, *June* 6, 809.

Lichfield, Earl of
- Railway Rates and Transit Facilities.
  - Agricultural Produce — Correspondence between Board of Agriculture and Railway Companies, etc., *June* 9, 1185–1189.
  - Milk—Condition of Carriage, Insanitary State of Vans, etc., *June* 9, 1190–1195.

Light Railways
- *see under* Railways.

Light Railways Bill
- *l.* 1R.* *May* 19, 309.

Lights and Lighthouses
- Expenditure by Lighthouse Authorities, Submitting Estimates of, to Board of Trade — Powers of Advisory Committee, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. C. McArthur; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *June* 8, 1070.
- Light Dues, Reduction in, etc.
  - *Qs.* Sir A. Rollit, Mr. A. Taylor; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *May* 19, 360.

Lincoln
- Railway, Light, to Scawby, Promotion of—Recommending Exchequer Contribution.
  - *Q.* Mr. S. Ormsby-Gore; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *June* 8, 1071–1072.

Liquor Licensing, etc.
- Dublin Victuallers' Association, Protest against Assessment levied on Members of—Making Inquiries.
  - *Q.* Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *June* 8, 1076–1077.

[*cont.*

Liquor Licensing, etc.—*cont.*
Licences.
Beer, Home-made, Licence required for brewing—Regulations as to Employment of Assistance.
Q. Mr. J. A. Pease ; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *June 8*, 1052–1053.
Number of, and Amount of Compensation Payable under Licensing Bill in England and Wales.
Return, Ordered, *June 1*, 494 ; Presented, *June 2*, 618.
Number Refused and Grounds of Refusal in 1901 and 1902.
Q. Mr. A. Davies ; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *June 9*, 1209.
Licensing Bill, *see that title.*

Listowel
Coach Service to Tarbet—Contract Price—Inviting Local Tenders.
Q. Mr. Flavin ; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, Mr. Speaker, *May 17*, 45–46.
Q. Mr. Flavin ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 19*, 365–366.

Littlestone-on-Sea & District Water Bill
l. Rep.* *May 17*, 1.
3R.* *June 10*, 1325.

Liverpool
Post Office.
Male Telegraph Learners, qualified, providing Appointments for.
Q. Mr. Shackleton ; *A.* Lord Stanley, *June 6*, 779–780.
Refreshment Intervals — Granting Fifteen in lieu of Ten Minutes for Tea.
Q. Mr. Shackleton ; *A.* Lord Stanley, *June 6*, 779.

Liverpool & London & Globe Insurance Company Bill
c. Con. May 18*, 157.
3R* *May 31*, 421.
l. Commons' Amendts. *Con.* June 7*, 907.

Liverpool and Wigan Churches Bill
l. Rep.* *May 19*, 305.
3R.* *June 9*, 1182.
c. 1R.* *June 13*, 1463.

Lloyd-Apjohn Estate, Limerick
Progress of Sale of.
Q. Mr. Lundon ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 17*, 43.

Lloyd-George, Mr. D. [Carnarvon District]
Aliens Bill—Expenses, Resolution as to, *June 8*, 1154.
Blocking Notices, Discussion in the House baulked by, *May 19*, 397, 398.
Education Board Provisional Order [Cardiff and Newport Monmouthshire] Bill, 2R., *June 13*, 1566.

Lloyd-George, Mr. D.—*cont.*
Fiscal Policy, Discussion of, in the House, Necessity for, *May 19*, 399.
Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *June 6*, 814 ; *June 7*, 955, 1029, 1030.
Time Limit Amendment contrary to standing Orders, *June 7*, 1029, 1030.
Transvaal, Importation of Chinese Labour to—Expenses to be defrayed by Transvaal Government, *May 19*, 396, 397.

Local Authorities
Consumption, Sanatoria for—Difficulties of abating nuisance caused by.
Os. Sir E. Sassoon, *May 19*, 386 ; Mr W. Long, 389.
Indebtedness of, growth of
O. Mr. Robson, *May 17*, 106, 107.

Local Government Board
President—Rt. Hon. W. H. Long.
Bacteriologist [Dr. Blaxall]—Use of Government lymph, etc., for private profit, alleged.
Os. Mr. Weir, *June 2*, 676, 679 ; Mr. Long, 678.
Housing of the Working Classes Acts, Granting sole powers as to administration of, to, proposed.
O. Mr. C. Hay, *June 2*, 653.
Re-organisation—Committee of Inquiry, Report of, on Duties of Board.
Date of issuing.
O. Mr. C. Hay, *June 2*, 654, 655.
Q. Mr. D. A. Thomas ; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *June 6*, 798.
Report Presented, *June 8*, 1045 ; *June*, *9*, 1184.

Local Government Board, Ireland
Grant—Amount and Application of Unexpended Balance, etc.
Q. Mr. Lundon ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 17*, 43–44.
Political meetings, Allowing paid Officials of District or County Councils to take part in.
Q. Mr. E. Mitchell ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 10*, 1371.

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill
c. 2R.* *May 17*, 23.

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill
c. 2R.* *June 3*, 714.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill
l. 2R.* *May 19*, 307.
Rep.* *June 9*, 1182.
3R.* *June 10*, 1326.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill
l. 2R* *May 19*, 307.
Rep.* *June 9*, 1182.
3R.* *June 10*, 1326.

ocal Government Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill
l. 2R.* *May 19*, 307.
Rep.* *June 9*, 1182.
3R., *June 10*, 1326.

ocal Government Provisional Order (No. 4.) Bill
c. Rep.* *June 13*, 1462.

ocal Government Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill
c. Rep.* *June 2*, 615.
3R.* *June 3*, 714.
l. 1R* *June 7*, 906.

ocal Government Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill
c. Rep.* *June 2*, 615.
3R.* *June 3*, 714.
l. 1R* *June 7*, 906.

ocal Government Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill
c. Rep.* *June 2*, 615.
3R.* *June 3*, 714.
l. 1R.* *June 7*, 906.

ocal Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill.
c. 2R. * *May 17*, 23.

ocal Government Provisional Orders (No 10) Bill.
c. 2R.* *May 17*, 23.

ocal Government Provisional Orders (No 11) Bill.
c. 2R.* *May 17*, 24.

ocal Government Provisional Orders (No. 12) Bill.
c. 2R.* *May 17*, 24.
Rep.* *June 2*, 615.
3R.* *June 3*, 714.
l. 1R.* *June 7*, 906.

ocal Government Provisional Orders (No, 13) Bill.
c. 2R.* *May 17*, 24.

ocal Government Provisional Orders (No. 14) Bill.
c. 2R.* *May 31*, 421.
Rep.* *June 10*, 1365.
3R.* *June 13*, 1461.

ocal Government Provisional Orders (No 15) Bill.
c. 2R.* *June 3*, 714.
Rep.* *June 10*, 1365.
3R.* *June 13*, 1461.

ocal Government Provisional Orders (Gas) Bill.
c. Rep.* *June 2*, 615.
3R.* *June 3*, 714.
l. 1R.* *June 7*, 906.

Local Government Provisional Order (Poor Law) Bill.
l. 2R.* *May 19*, 307.
Rep.* *June 9*, 1182.
3R., *June 10*, 1326.

Local Taxation
Account, objections to, References to, in debate on the Finance Bill, *May 17*, 79, 80, 92.
Commission of Inquiry—Boards of Guardians, Representation of.
Q. Mr. Osmond Williams; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *June 13*, 1473.
Grants in aid of, increase in, etc., References to, in debate on the Finance Bill, *May 17*, 91, 92, 107, 144.

Loch Leven
Trout from, laying down, in Upper Bann River.
Q. Mr. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 3*, 719.

Loch Leven Water Powers Bill
c. 1R.* *June 7*, 914.

Lock-outs and Strikes
Report (1903), presented, *May 31*, 426; *June 7*, 910.

Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. [Essex, Epping]
Income Tax on Schoolmasters' Emoluments, *June 1*, 497.

Locomotives on Highways
Motor Cars, *see that title.*
Traction Engines, damage done to roads by —Necessity for regulations as to speed, etc.
Os. Sir E. Strachey, *June 2*, 634; Mr. Long, 637; Mr. H. Hobhouse, 638.

London
Post Office Sorter Tracers, Memorial as to Pay and Promotion from, Answering.
Q Mr. Kimber; *A.* Lord Stanley, *June 6*, 781.
Street Traffic Commission, Date of tabling Report of—Allowing Opportunity for Discussion.
Q. Mr. Galloway; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *June 8*, 1066.
Water Act, Appointed Day under, postponing, pending Settlement of Appeal Case of New River Company,
Q. Col. Bowles; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *June 2*, 618.

London and India Docks Company Bill
c. 3R.* *May 17*, 23.
l. 1R* *May 19*, 306.

London County Council
Expenditure, Estimate of—Returns, presented, *June 6*, 776.
Financial Returns to 31 March 1904, presented, *June 7*, 911.

London County Council (Money) Bill
- *c.* Rep.* *June 2*, 615.
  - *Con.** *June 8*, 1041.
  - 3R.* *June 13*, 1461.
- *l.* 1R.* *June 13*, 1418.

London County Council (Tramways and Improvements) Bill
- *c.* Rep.* *May 17*, 25.
  - *Con. June 9*, 1296.
  - 3R.* *June 13*, 1461.
- *l.* 1R.* *June 13*, 1418.
- *Debate on Consideration* (Commons), *June 9*, 1296.
  - Extension of Tramways across Westminster Bridge, 1298, 1299.
  - Obstruction at Westminster Bridge, Prevention of—New Clause, 1296–1301.
  - Omnibus Proprietors, Opposition of, 1311.
  - Hampstead Road Tramway — Electrification of, 1305.
    - Extension of, down Tottenham Court Road, proposed, 1302–1314.

London, Tilbury and Southend Railway Bill
- *l.* Rep.* *May 17*, 1.

London United Tramways Bill
- *c. Con.** *June 1*, 489.
  - 3R.* *June 6*, 773.
- *l.* 1R.* *June 7*, 907.

Londonderry
- Inspection of Luggage at—Inconvenience of Custom House Arrangements.
  - *O.* Mr. C. Devlin, *May 31*, 445.
- Irish Society Estates, Sale of — Taking Precautions to Carry out Objects of the Trust, etc.
  - *Qs.* Mr. O'Doherty, Mr. T W. Russell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 7*, 930–931.

Long, Rt. Hon. W. H.—*President of the Local Government Board* [Bristol, S.]
- Aliens Bill—Expenses, Resolution as to, *June 8*, 1152, 1153, 1155.
- Blaxall, Dr.—Alleged use of Government Lymph, etc., for Private Profit, *June 2*, 678.
- Borough Councils, Indebtedness of, Return relating to, *June 1*, 495.
- Consumption, Sanatoria for—Growth of, Danger of, and inability of Local Authorities to cope with, alleged, *May 19*, 389.
- Deaths, List of, supplied by Registrars in country places to weekly newspapers—continuing practice, *June 8*, 1048–1049, 1073.
- Education — Expenses of Elementary Schools — Making one Payment to Correspondent for Distribution without involving responsibility to Auditor, etc., *June 10*, 1369.

Long, Rt. Hon. W. H.—*cont.*
- Housing of the Working Classes.
  - Administration of Acts—Vesting s power as to, in the Local Gove ment Board, proposed, *June* 667.
  - Loans, Regulations as to, *June 2*, 66
  - Official to deal with exclusively, p posed, *June 2*, 666.
- London Water Act, Postponing Appoin Day under, pending Settlement Appeal Case of New River Compa *June 2*, 618.
- Motor Cars.
  - Speed Regulations.
    - County Council opinion to sought before framing, p posed, *June 9*, 1225.
    - Local Authorities, Granting pov to, to enforce, *June 2*, 636.
    - London—Persons responsible regulation of traffic, 638.
    - Notice boards, Provision of, *Jun* 637.
- Poor Law.
  - Children.
    - Educational Progress, Granti facilities for Testing, to Bo of Education, *June 2*, 665.
    - Emigration of, to the Colon proposed, *June 2*, 66 *June 13*, 1473.
    - Hanwell Schools, Overcrowding *June 2*, 664, 665.
    - Ringworm and Ophthalmia, St tistics as to, *June 13*, 1472.
    - Scattered Homes for—Extens of System, proposed, *June* 669.
    - Wigan Board of Guardians and scattered homes system, *J* *2*, 645, 664.
    - Workhouses, Undesirability retaining in, *June 2*, 663.
  - Officers in East End parishes, Grant gratuities or higher salaries *June 2*, 666.
  - Unions, Readjustment of Areas a Uniformity of Valuation, *June* 1473.
- Rates, Particulars of, Liability of Rat Officers to furnish, *May 19*, 361; *J* *2*, 678.
- Taxation, Local—Commission of Inquir Representation of Boards of Guardia *June 13*, 1473.
- Traction Engines, Damage done to Ro by, *June 2*, 637.
- Vaccination.
  - Brighton Regulations—Forms issu by Registrar to parents of new born infants, *May 19*, 361.

[*cont.*

ong, Rt. Hon. W. H.—*cont.*
- Vaccination—*cont.*
  - Lymph — Standard of quality and strength, Fixing, proposed, *June 2*, 678.
  - Prosecutions in Lambeth — Employment of Solicitor by Vaccination Officer, *June 9*, 1210.
- Vagrants, Difficulties of dealing with—Establishment of Labour Colonies, etc., proposed, *June 2*, 668.
- Workhouses.
  - Rural, Condition of—Appointment of Committee of Inspection, proposed, *June 2*, 669.
  - Sick Nursing in—Local Government Board Order, *June 13*, 1472.

ongford Estate, Westmeath
- Sale, Arrangements for—Application of A. Caddell for Re-instatement.
  - *Q.* Mr. Sullivan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 6*, 801.

ongworth Estate, Galway
- Purchase by Congested Districts Board—Enlarging adjoining Holdings.
  - *Q.* Mr. Roche; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 17*, 31-32.

onsdale, Mr. J. B. [Armagh, Mid.]
- Armagh Telegraph Office, Hours of Duty in, *June 2*, 619.
- Ballinasloe Asylum — Junior Medical Officer — Fixing Maximum Age for Applicants to Post at Forty, *June 8*, 1076.
- Labourers (Ireland) Bill—Date of Second Reading, *June 8*, 1076.
- Trinity College Lands Commission—Names of Members, *June 8*, 1076.

ord Advocate for Scotland
- *Mr. Scott-Dickson.*

ord Chancellor
- *Earl of Halsbury.*

ord Chancellor of Ireland
- *Lord Ashbourne.*

ord Chief Justice
- *Lord Alverstone.*

ord Great Chamberlain
- *Marquess of Cholmondeley.*

ord Justice-General of Scotland
- *Lord Kinross.*

ord-Lieutenant of Ireland
- *Earl of Dudley.*

ord President of the Privy Council
- *Marquess of Londonderry.*

ord Privy Seal
- *Marquess of Salisbury.*

Lord Tredegar's Supplemental Estate Bill
- *l.* 2R.* *June 9*, 1182.

Lothians Electric Power Bill
- *l.* Rep.* *May 19*, 305.
  - 3R.* *June 10*, 1325.
- *c.* 1R.* *June 13*, 1463.

Lough, Mr. T. [Islington, W.]
- Aliens Bill.
  - Expenses—Resolution as to, *June 8*, 1132.
  - Motion to Commit to Standing Committee on Law, *June 8*, 1088.
- Business of the House, Order of, *May 31*, 436.
- Customs Department — Port, and Star Allowances—Information as to, *May 31*, 469.
- Finance Bill, 2R., *May 18*, 206.
  - Date of Discussion on, *June 2*, 631.
- Indian Councils Bill, 2R., *June 1*, 612.
- Ireland, Over-taxation of, *May 18*, 206-211.
- Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *June 6*, 832.
- National Telephone Company, Progress of Post Office Negotiations with, etc., *June 6*, 796-797.
- Penal Servitude Bill, Publication of Rules under, by *The Times* before issuing to Members, *June 8*, 1080, 1081.
- Police—Metropolitan Force—Length of Annual Leave, *June 7*, 918-919.
- Sugar, Certificates of Origin, and Bonding of, Information as to, *May 31*, 465.
- Tea.
  - Custom House Inspection of, *May 31*, 463, 464.
  - Duty on — Operations in Bond and Regulations as to Bulking together Parcels, *June 13*, 1474.
- Tibet Expedition—Enemy's Loss of Life, *May 31*, 435.
- Transvaal, Importation of Chinese Labour to—Asiatics as Overseers, Regulations as to, *June 8*, 1060.

Lovat, Lord
- Yeomanry.
  - Equipment, Training and Organisation of, Defects in, *June 13*, 1435-1440.
  - Establishment, Changes in, Proposed Reduction in Strength of Units, etc., *May 19*, 310-314.
  - Horses, Number of, *May 19*, 312.
  - Special Service Squadron Scheme, *May 19*, 322.

Lowther, Rt. Hon. J. W.—*Chairman of Committees,* [Cumberland, Penrith]
- Absence of, *June 9*, 1201.
- Rulings as Chairman, *see under* Chairman.

[*cont.*

Loyd, Mr. A. K. [Berks, Abingdon]
- Army Expenditure, Increase in—Proportion due to Increased Pay and Improved Barrack Accommodation, *May 19*, 356.
- Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *June 7*, 994.

Lunacy Bill
- *c.* 1R.* *May 18*, 186.

Lunatics
- Asylums.
  - Ballinasloe, *see under that title.*
  - Bethlehem Royal Hospital—Violation of Lunacy Act — Preventing Occurrence of Similar Cases.
    - *Q.* Mr. C. Grant; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *May 18*, 179–180.
  - Expenditure and Cost per Head of Lunatics.
    - Return Ordered, *June 13*, 1466.
  - Indebtedness of Counties and County Boroughs for Erection and Maintenance of, etc.—Granting Return.
    - *Q.* Mr. C. Hobhouse; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *May 31*, 426–427.
- Intemperance, Granting Return showing total Number of Lunacy Cases due to.
  - *Q.* Mr. H. Craig; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *June 8*, 1064–1065.

Lundon, Mr. W. [Limerick, E.]
- Constabulary, R. I.—Dismissal of Constable Anderson, *June 13*, 1500.
- Lloyd-Apjohn Estate, Limerick—Progress of Sale, *May 17*, 43.
- Local Government (Ireland) Grant—Amount and Application of Unexpended Balance, etc., *May 17*, 43.
- Railway Employees and Benefit Societies, Conditions imposed by Companies, etc., *June 9*, 1224.
- Trade Disputes Bill—Date of Third Reading, *June 9*, 1232.

Lyell, Mr. [Dorsetshire, E.]
- Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *June 7*, 985.
- Militia—Dining Tents, Alleged Refusal of Government to supply, *May 19*, 355.

Lymph
- Central Vaccine Institution for Scotland, Supplying to—Using Glycerinated in place of Humanised Lymph.
  - *Q.* Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *June 8*, 1074–1075.
- National Vaccine Establishment—Details of Expenditure.
  - *Q.* Mr. Weir, *June 2*, 677.
- Standard of Quality and Strength, fixing, Proposed.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Weir, *June 2*, 677, 679; Mr. Long, 678.

Lytham Improvement Bill
- *c.* *Con.** *May 31*, 421.
  - 3R.* *June 3*, 713.
- *l.* 1R.* *June 7*, 906.

Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred—*Secretary of S for the Colonies* [Warwick and Le ington]
- Columbia, British, Provincial Immigrat Act 1904 of, Protests from Japan as etc., *June 8*, 1061.
- Crown Agents.
  - Audited Accounts 1900 to 1902, tabl *May 18*, 174.
  - Malta, Value of Stores supplied and Commission charged e year 1899-1903, etc., *May 31*,
- Cyprus, Archbishopric, Vacant, of, St taken as to, *June 1*, 497–498.
- Defence of the Empire, Colonial Contri tions towards.
  - Canadian Views on, *June 2*, 622.
  - Milner, Lord, Views expressed Sanction of Government to, e *June 2*, 622.
- Egypt and the Soudan, Total Number British Subjects in — Proportion Maltese, *May 31*, 432.
- France, Arbitration Treaty with—N foundland, Benefit derived by, Contribution towards Cost, *June* 720–721.
- Ibibio Country, Military Patrol throu Object of, etc., *June 2*, 620.
- Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *June 6*, 896.
- Malta.
  - Constitution of—Changes effected Letters Patent, 15th April, 1 *May 31*, 433.
  - Crown Agents, Value of Stores s plied by, and Commission charg each year 1899-1903, etc., *May* 432.
  - Egypt and the Soudan, Number Maltese in, *May 31*, 432.
  - Financial Statement — Allowing Depreciation of Securities—R on Savings Bank — Propos Government Action, *May 31*, 4
  - Press Offences, Law regarding—Tr by Jury, *May 31* 431.
- Orange River Colony, Finance—Inform tion as to present position, *June* 1220.
- Rhodesia.
  - Mines—Native Mortality in Seluk Gold Mines — Date of tabl Report, *June 6*, 791.
  - Southern, Proposed Introduction Chinese Labour to, Terms Resolution favouring, etc., *Jun* 792.

[*cont.*

Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred—*cont.*
- Transvaal.
  - British Indian Traders in.
    - Boer Court Decisions against, upheld by Local Government —Action of Colonial Office, etc., *May 19*, 357-358.
    - Rights of, *June 13*, 1487.
  - Chinese Labour, Importation of.
    - Advance Party, Arrival of, at Durban, alleged, *June 13*, 1486.
    - Arresting, in View of Successful Financial Condition of Colony, *June 8*, 1062.
    - Asiatics as Overseers, Regulations as to, *June 8*, 1060.
    - Australian Parliament, Resolutions passed by—Divisional Figures—Terms, *May 18*, 176-177.
    - Cape Colony Legislative Assembly — Chinese Exclusion Bill, Reason for Refusing Governor's Assent to, *June 10*, 1371-1372.
    - Consul, Chinese, Powers of, *June 9*, 1216.
    - Expenses of, to be Defrayed by Transvaal Government, *May 19*, 387, 393, 394, 397.
    - Hong Kong, Coolies Awaiting Shipment at — Isolation — Numbers, *May 19*, 356.
    - Hours of Work—Sunday Labour, *May 18*, 176.
    - Intoxicants, Sale of, to Labourers —Arrangements, *May 17*, 37 ; *June 8*, 1061.
    - Natives Liberated for Agricultural purposes by, Estimated Number of, *June 8*, 1061.
    - Offices, Depôts, etc., Estimated Cost of Building—Authority Responsible for Cost, etc., *May 31*, 434.
    - Ordinance with Regulations and Terms of Contract, etc.,—Date of Presenting to Parliament, *May 19*, 394.
    - Regulations, Date of tabling, *May 18*, 174.
    - Unskilled Work, Provisions for restriction to, *June 9*, 1216-1218 ; *June 13*, 1483, 1485.
    - Wages Regulations, *May 17*, 37 ; *May 19*, 395, 396.
      - Minimum Wage — Kaffirs' Wages, etc., *May 18*, 175, 176 ; *June 13*, 1483-1485.
    - White Labour, Effect on—Class of Work open to the Chinese, etc., *June 9*, 1216, 1217, 1218.

Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred—*cont.*
- Transvaal—*cont.*
  - Chinese Labour, Importation of—*cont.*
    - Wives and Children of Labourers —Number Accompanying or Following the first Thousand Emigrants, *June 7*, 923.
  - Dynamite, Import Duty on, Exclusion of British Manufacturer by, alleged, *June 9*, 1219.
  - Financial Condition of.
    - Chinese Labour, Arresting Importation of, in view of, *June 8*, 1062.
    - Information as to present position, *June 9*, 1218, 1220.
  - Labour Question in.
    - British Central Africans.
      - Latest Date of Importation of, in 1904 - Prohibiting Importation in Winter, etc., *June 6*, 792.
      - Wages of, *June 9*, 1212.
    - Chinese Labour, *see that subheading*.
    - Native Labour in Mines.
      - Forced Labour for offenders alleged, *May 18*, 177, 178; *June 13*, 1486.
      - Inspectors, Motive of Appointment of — Knowledge of Native Languages, etc. *May 18*, 175.
      - Punishment of Natives, *June 7*, 923.
      - Wages, *June 13*, 1484, 1485.
  - Magistrates — Names, Ages, Experience, etc., of Nominees, Receipt of Despatch from Lord Milner with Information for Return showing, *May 18*, 177.
  - Mines.
    - Commissioner of, Name, Salary, Previous Experience, etc., of, *June 6*, 790-791.
  - Labour for, *see subheadings* Chinese *and* Labour.
    - Robinson Deep Mine, Accident at—Tabling Coroner's Jury's Verdict — Workmen's Compensation, *May 18*, 173.
    - Rock Drilling, Precautions with regard to—Scientific Investigations, *May 17*, 38-39.
    - Tax on gold mine profits, Method of assessing—Presentation of Papers, proposed, *June 9*, 1220.
  - Railways, Commissioner of, Name, Salary, Previous Experience, etc., of, *June 6*, 790.
  - Zontpansberg, Alleged unrest among the Natives of, *June 13*, 1487.

McArthur, Mr. C. [Liverpool, Exchange]
Lighthouse Authorities, Expenditure by, *June 8*, 1070.

McCrae, Mr. G. [Edinburgh, East]
Aliens Bill—Expenses, Resolution as to, *June 8*, 1141.
Education [Scotland] Bill, *Com.*, *June 13*, 1580.
Volunteers, Vote for, Making Statement on Norfolk Commission previous to taking, *June 8*, 1080.

Macdona, Mr. J. C. [Southwark, Rotherhithe]
Thames River Steamboat Service Bill, *Con.*, *June 2*, 702.

McDonnell, Sir Antony P.
Pay and Services of, during 1903–4.
Q. Mr. C. Craig; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 10*, 1370.

Macedonia
Civil Assessors, Work of, Failure to render Reports, etc.
Os. Earl Percy, *May 19*, 413, 417; Mr. Bryce, 417; Earl Percy, *June 9*, 1321.
Q. Mr. C. Allen; *A.* Earl Percy, *June 7*, 926.
Gendarmerie, Reorganisation of, under European Officers.
Belgian and Swedish Officers, Numbers, Duties, etc., of.
Q. Mr. Moon; *A.* Earl Percy, *June 8*, 1047.
British Officers serving with Gendarmerie and Foreign Staff Officers, Names of.
Q. Mr. Moon; *A.* Earl Percy, *June 8*, 1047–1048.
Giorgis, General, Tabling Proposals of.
Q. Mr. H. Samuel; *A.* Earl Percy, *June 7*, 925–926.
Progress of Scheme.
Os. Mr. J. A. Pease, *May 19*, 396; Earl Percy, 412, 413; *June 9*, 1321.
Reforms, Progress of.
Os. Mr. J. A. Pease, *May 19*, 396; Earl Percy, 412, 413.
Refugees from, Repatriation of, Arrangements made by Turkish and Bulgarian Governments for.
Q. Mr. Whitley; *A.* Earl Percy, *June 7*, 925.

McKean, Mr. J. [Monaghan, S.]
Clones Post Office—New Building, Arrangements of, *June 9*, 1207.

McKenna, Mr. R. [Monmouth, N.]
Aliens Bill.
Expenses, Resolution as to, *June 8*, 1134.
Motion to commit to Standing Committee on Law, *June 8*, 1099.
Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *June 6*, 815.

McKenna, Mr. R.—*cont.*
Transvaal, Importation of Chinese Labour to—White labour, increase in—Alleged breach of faith by the Government—Possibility of discussing, *June 9*, 1083.

McKillop, Mr. W. [Sligo, N.]
Aughris, Sligo—Completion of Pier and Boatslip, *May 18*, 182.

Macnamara, Dr. T. J. [Camberwell, N.]
Education Board Provisional Orders (Cardiff and Newport Monmouthshire) Bill, 2R., *June 13*, 1562.
Education (Scotland) Bill, *Com.*, *June 13*, 1520, 1529, 1544, 1589.
London County Council (Tramways and Improvements) Bill, *Con.*, *June 9*, 1297.
Shop Hours Bill, 2R., *June 1*, 603.
Transvaal, Importation of Chinese Labour to.
Unskilled work, provisions for restriction to, *June 13*, 1485.
Wages—Minimum Amount Payable, *June 13*, 1483–1485.

MacNeill, Mr. J. G. S. [Donegal, S.]
Afghanistan, Amir of—Alleged refusal of allowance from Indian Government, *June 13*, 1476.
Cape Colony Legislative Assembly—Chinese Exclusion Bill, Reason for refusing Governor's Assent to, etc., *June 10*, 1371.
India—Governor-General, Vacation of Office of, by Absence from India—Acting Governor, *June 10*, 1372.
Petty Sessions and right of appeal against sentences—assimilation of English and Irish Law, proposed, *June 13*, 1477.
Teenan Estate, Evictions on—Enabling Tenants to purchase Holdings, *June 10*, 1370–1371.
Tibet Expedition—Use of Explosive Bullets, *June 10*, 1369.

Maconochie, Mr. A. W. [Aberdeenshire, E.]
Customs Department—Inspection of luggage at Dover and Newhaven, Arrangements as to, *May 31*, 444.
Education [Scotland] Bill, *Com.*, *June 13*, 1523, 1533.

MacVeagh, Mr. J. [Down, S.]
Agricultural Department, Ireland—Veterinary Branch, Memorial of Officers in, Cause of Delay in answering, *June 3*, 718.
Ardglass Herring Fishery Inquiry, Result of, *June 2*, 626.
Army—Soldiers in Uniform, refusal to admit, in Public Places, *June 6*, 788.
Constabulary, R.I.—Dismissal of Constable Anderson, *June 13*, 1501.

[*cont.*

MacVeagh, Mr. J.—*cont.*
  Division Challenged frivolously—Precedent for claiming irrespective of Numbers, *June 2*, 709.
  Down, Number of Landlords and Tenants in—Names of Landlords agreeing to sell under Land Act, etc., *June 6*, 801.
  Education—National School Teachers.
    Average, reducing, in Case of Several Assistants to one School, *June 3*, 718.
    Salaries, Statistics and Regulations as to Increments of, *June 6*, 784–785.
    School Attendance Committees, Appointment as Secretaries of, Approval of the Board to, etc., *June 3*, 719.
    Standard Numbers for different Grades, Responsibility for fixing—Inter-Grade Teachers, *June 6*, 784.
  Licensing Bill—Date of Consideration, *June 9*, 1233.
  Loch Leven Trout, laying down, in Upper Bann River, *June 3*, 719.
  Motor Car Services in Ireland, granting Local Authorities Power to levy Rate for establishing, *June 2*, 626.
  Parliamentary Procedure—New Rules—Blocking Motions, taking steps to prevent, *June 9*, 1232.
  Poor Law—Irish Outdoor relief regulations, *June 9*, 1228.
  Post Office – Kilcoo, Delay in Delivery of Letters at, *June 2*, 627.
  Telegraph Service, Ireland—Female Telegraphists, Vacancies among, since Dec. 12, 1903, *June 3*, 717.
  Trawling, Illegal.
    Destruction of Seized Tackle in lieu of sale, proposed, etc., *June 8*, 1072, 1073.
    Protection of Local Fishermen, Steps taken for, *June 9*, 1229.

Madagascar
  Commercial Rights and Privileges in—Settlement of, under Anglo-French Convention.
    O. Earl Percy, *June 1*, 501, 502.

Magazines
  Postage Rates to and from the Colonies, proposed Reduction of, Estimated Loss of Revenue by.
    Q. Sir G. Parker; *A.* Lord Stanley, *June 8*, 1069–1070.

Magistrates and Justices of the Peace, Ireland
  Judges, Reduction in Number of proposed.
    O. Mr. T. M. Healy, *May 18*, 216.

Mail Service
  See under Post Office.

Malcolm, Mr. I. Z. [Suffolk, Stowmarket]
  Musical Copyright Bill, *Con.*, *June 10*, 1381, 1382.
  Parliamentary Procedure—New Rules—Blocking Notices—Amending Standing Orders governing Motions for Adjournment, *June 2*, 628–629.

Mallaig, Scotland
  Breakwater at—Date of Completion.
    O. Mr. Weir, *June 2*, 710.

Malta
  Constitution of — Changes effected by Letters Patent 15th April, 1904, with Reference to Election of Members of Council.
    Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 31*, 432–433.
  Crown Agents, Value of Stores supplied and Commission Charged each year 1899-1903, etc.
    Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 31*, 432.
  Dockyard, Extension of—Date of Completing Work.
    Q. Mr. Galloway; *A.* Mr. A. Lee, *June 8*, 1057.
  Egypt and the Soudan, Number of Maltese in.
    Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 31*, 431–432.
  Financial Statement — Allowing for Depreciation in Securities—Run on Savings Bank—Proposed Government Action.
    Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton *May 31*, 430.
  Italian Trade, Value of, in each year 1898-1902.
    Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *May 31*, 431.
  Press Offences, Law Regarding—Trial by Jury.
    Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 31*, 430–431.

Manchester Ship Canal Bill
  l. Report from Select Committee, *June 10*, 1325.

Manners, Lord C. R. J. [Leicestershire, Melton]
  Kensington Gardens, Proposed Sand Ride in, *June 8*, 1050.

Mansfield, Mr. H. [Lincolnshire, Spalding]
  Deaths, List of, Supplying, to Newspapers by Registrars, *June 8*, 1073.

Marine Insurance Bill
  Re-introduction, Date of.
    Qs. Sir A. Rollit; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *May 19*, 368; *June 13*, 1468.

Markham, Mr. A. B. [Nottinghamshire, Mansfield]
  Cotton Corners, *June 7*, 933.
  Division—Omission of Name, *June 3*, 806.

Markham, Mr. A. B.—*cont.*

Fiscal Policy—Amendment to Mr. Black's Motion handed in by the Prime Minister after the Speaker had left the Chair, alleged, *May 18*, 184.

Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *June 6*, 869.

Mines.

Coal—Explosives, Tests for, *June 9*, 1223, 1224.

Wet Drilling in, Making Compulsory, *June 8*, 1067.

Rhodesia, Southern—Proposed Introduction of Chinese Labour, *June 6*, 793.

Roberts, Lord, Reasons for Continuation of Full Pay to, *June 9*, 1214.

Transvaal.

Chinese Labour, Importation of.

Asiatics as Overseers, Regulations as to, *June 8*, 1059–1060.

Wages of Labourers—Reduction of Minimum Wage, *May 18*, 175–176.

White Labour, Effect on—Class of Work open to the Chinese, *June 9*, 1217.

Dynamite, Import Duty on, Exclusion of British Manufacturers by, alleged, *June 9*, 1219.

Marlborough, Duke of [*Parliamentary Secretary for the Colonies*]

Crown Agents—Remuneration and Method of Transacting Business—Appointment of Committee of Inquiry into, proposed, *June 10*, 1346–1357.

Marriages

Ireland — Report of Registrar-General (1891–1900) presented, *May 31*, 424; *June 7*, 908.

Married Women's Property Act (1882), Amendment Bill

l. 1R.* *May 17*, 5.

Marylebone Chapels (St. James', Westmoreland Street) Bill

c. 2R.* *May 31*, 421.
Rep.* *June 10*, 1365.

Massey-Mainwaring, Mr. W. F. B. [Finsbury, Central]

Rocket and Line Apparatus, Supplying, in the Navy, and making compulsory for Merchant Ships, *May 18*, 169–170.

Maxwell, Rt. Hon. Sir H. E. [Wigton]

Education, Scotland—Fund—Amount payable under Subsection (3) (E) and (F) of Clause 39, *May 18*, 167.

Maxwell, Mr. W. J. [Dumfriesshire]

Education — Cummertrees School — New Building, *June 8*, 1075.

Education [Scotland] Bill, *Com.*, *June 13*, 1532.

Meat

Frozen or Chilled—Increase in Cancer due to, alleged.
O. Mr. A. Davies, *June 2*, 675.

Price, Average, and Consumption per head during last five years and five years previous to Repeal of Corn Laws.
Q. Mr. A. Davies; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *May 18*, 166–168.

Mecca

Pilgrims to, Protection for—Making Representations to Egyptian Government.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Earl Percy, *June 7*, 924–925.

Medical Officers of Health

Number employed by County Councils, Terms of Appointment, etc.

Return ordered, *May 18*, 160.

Merchant Shipping

Coasting Trade.

Philippine Islands, Application of United States Coastwise laws to—Representations on the part of H.M. Government.
Os. Lord Muskerry, *June 13*, 1454–1456; Marquess of Lansdowne, 1458, 1459.

Practice of other maritime countries in reserving to vessels of their own nationality — Representations by H.M. Government, etc.
Os. Lord Muskerry, *June 13*, 1454, 1456; Marquess of Lansdowne, 1456, 1457; Earl Spencer, 1459.

Foreign Ships—Application of statutory requirements — Nomination of select Committee of Inquiry, *June 8*, 1083.

Navigation and Shipping—Annual Statement Presented, *June 8*, 1045; *June 9*, 1184.

Rocket and Line Apparatus, Making compulsory to carry.
Q. Mr. Massey-Mainwaring; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *May 18*, 169–170.

Seamen.

Fund—Account of Receipts and Expenditure under Winding-up Act Presented, *June 10*, 1327, 1368.

"Turbo," Chinese Seamen, Trial of, for desertion, Grounds for charge, etc.
Q. Mr. Joyce; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *June 9*, 1208.

Sight Tests—Report (1903) Presented, *May 31*, 426; *June 7*, 910.

Merchant Shipping Act, 1894' Amendment Bill

l. 1R.* *June 10*, 1327.

Meteorology
Grant, Administration of, Report of Committee of Inquiry into—Tabling, proposed.
Q. Mr. Dalziel; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *June 9*, 1225.
Report, etc. Presented, *June 9*, 1184, 1204.

Metropolitan Board of Works
Financial Return to 31st March, 1904, Presented, *June 7*, 911.

Metropolitan Police
Leave, Annual, Length of, Allowing Fortnightly Leave to be added to.
Q. Mr. Lough; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *June 7*, 918–919.

Middlesborough
Post Office — Case of Mr. Chandler—Revision of Duties proposed.
Q. Mr. Henderson; *A.* Lord Stanley, *June 13*, 1470.

Middlesborough, Stockton-on-Tees, and Thornaby Tramways Bill
c. Rep.*, *May 18*, 157.
*Con.** *June 1*, 489.
3R.* *June 6*, 773.
l. 1R.* *June 7*, 907.

Midland Railway Bill
l. Rep.*, *June 10*, 1325.

Militia
Ballot Act, Suggested Revival of, as an Alternative to Compulsory Service.
Q. Sir F. Banbury; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *June 8*, 1057–1058.
Dining Tents, Alleged Government Refusal to supply.
Q. Mr. Runciman; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *May 18*, 172–173.
Qs. Mr. Lyell, Mr. C. Warner; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *May 19*, 355.
Norfolk Commission of Inquiry.
Compulsory Service, *see that title.*
Recommendations, Date of putting in force.
Q. Sir E. Flower; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *June 13*, 1478.
Report Presented, *May 31*, 424; *June 7*, 908.

Milk
Adulteration of.
Local Authorities, Slackness of—Delegating powers to the London County Council, proposed.
Os. Mr. Kearley, *June 2*, 671, 672; Mr. G. Lawson, 673.
Percentage of — Preservatives and Colouring Matters.
Os. Mr. Kearley, *June 2*, 670, 671.

Milk—*cont.*
Adulteration of—*cont.*
Steps taken to check—Standard of Purity, etc.
Os. Mr. G. Lawson, *June 2*, 673; Mr. Weir, 675, 679.
Epidemics due to—Inspection of Dairies by Public Veterinary Surgeons Proposed
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Grant Lawson, *June 13*, 1489.
Railway rates and transit facilities, *see under* Railways.

Milner, Rt. Hon. Sir F. G. [Notts, Bassetlaw]
Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *June 6*, 860.

Milvain, Mr. T. [Hampstead]
Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *June 6*, 845.

Minehead Urban District Council Water Bill
c. 2R.* *May 31*, 421.

Mines
Coal—Explosives, Tests for.
Qs. Mr. Markham; *As.* Mr. A. Douglas, *June 9*, 1223, 1224.
Cornwall—Health of Miners—Report Presented, *May 31*, 423; *June 7*, 908.
Foreign and Colonial—General Report and Statistics Presented, *May 17*, 428.
Transvaal, *see under* Transvaal.
United Kingdom—Report and Statistics (1903) Presented, *June 2*, 618; *June 7*, 908, 918.
Wet drilling in, Making compulsory in view of Prevalence of Phthisis with dry drilling.
Q. Mr. Markham; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *June 8*, 1067–1068.

Mitchell, Mr. E. [Fermanagh, N.]
Derrygonnelly, Insanitary Condition of, Taking Immediate Steps to remedy, *May, 17*, 42.
Political Meetings, Allowing paid Officials of District and County Councils to take part in, *June 10*, 1371.

Money Orders
See under Post Office.

Mongolia
Journey in — Report by Mr. G. J. Kidston, Presented, *May 18*, 159; *May 19*, 308.

Monkswell, Lord
Yeomanry Units, Proposed reduction in strength of, *May 19*, 325–326.

Monmouthshire
Military Commands — Creating Separate Command for.
Q. Mr. D. A. Thomas; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *May 17*, 38.

Moon, Mr. E. R. P. [St. Pancras, N.]
  Anglo-French Convention Bill, 2R., *June 1*, 545.
  Macedonia Gendarmerie, Re-organisation of, under European Officers,
    Belgian and Swedish Officers, Numbers, Duties etc. of, *June 8*, 1047.
    British Officers serving with Gendarmerie and Foreign Staff Officers, Names of, 1047–1048.

Mooney, Mr. J. J. [Dublin County, S.]
  Dublin.
    Cycle Thefts in.
      Legal Representation of the Crown in Trial as to, *May 19*, 364.
      Number purchased by Constabulary, etc., *June 13*, 1495.
    College of Science. Architects of, Rate of Remuneration for, *May 19*, 363.

Moore, Mr. W. [Antrim, N.]
  Drogheda Mortuary, Body left for two Months in, *June 8*, 1054.

Morgan, Mr. J. L. [Carmarthen, W.]
  Musical Copyright Bill, *Con.*, *June 10*, 1383.

Morocco
  Arbitration Treaty between Great Britain and France, *see under* France.
  Franco - Spanish Agreement as to, Tabling
    Q. Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Earl Percy, *June 8*, 1064.

Motherwell and Bellshill Railway (Abandonment) Order Confirmation Bill
  c. 1R.* *June 1*, 490.
    2R.* *June 9*, 1202.
    *Con.** *June 13*, 1461.

Motor Cars
  County Council representations, Consideration of. before framing Regulations, proposed.
    Q. Mr. Gardner; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *June 9*, 1225.
    Q. Mr. Gardner; *A.* Mr. G. Lawson, *June 13*, 1490.
  Ireland, Services in, Granting Local Authorities Power to levy Rate for Establishment of, Introducing Bill for.
    Q. Mr. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 2*, 626–627.
  Parks, Regulations for, Speed limit, etc., *Qs.* Mr. C. Wason, Dr. Farquharson; *As.* Lord Balcarres, *June 9*, 1225, 1226.
  Speed Regulations.
    Imprisonment after third offence where injury has been caused, proposed, *O.* Sir C. Rasch, *June 2*, 638.
    Local Authorities, Granting power to, to enforce regulations, proposed.
      Os. Sir E. Strachey, *June 2*, 633; Mr. C. Wason, 635; Mr. Long, 636.

Motor Cars—*cont.*
  Speed Regulations—*cont.*
    London, Persons responsible for Regulating Speed in.
      Os. Mr. Nussey, *June 2*, 636; Mr. Long, 638.
    Warning Notices to Drivers, Provision of, proposed.
      Os. Sir E. Strachey, *June 2*, 632–634; Mr. Long, 637.
  Traders' Licences under the Act of 1903, Protection afforded by—Case of Mr. Macleod — Proposed Government Action.
    Q. Mr. Scott-Montagu; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *May 19*, 347.

Motor Cycles
  Furious Driving in Trafalgar Square and Pall Mall—Prosecuting Offenders.
    Q. Mr. C. Wason; *A.* Mr. A Douglas, *May 17*, 40.

Moulton, Mr. J. F. [Cornwall, Launceston]
  Aliens Bill—Motion to commit to Standing Committee on Law, *June 8*, 1110.

Mount, Mr. W. A. [Berks, Newbury]
  Musical Copyright Bill, *Con.*, *June 10*, 1372, 1373, 1385.

Mountrath, Queen's County
  Telegraph Connection with Coolrain, Delay in Completing.
    Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 18*, 164–165.

Municipal Franchise (Companies) Bill
  c. 1R.* *June 6*, 808.

Muntz, Sir P. A. [Warwickshire, Tamworth]
  Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *June 7*, 1001.

Murnaghan, Mr. G. [Tyrone, Mid.]
  Public Buildings, Irish—Insurance against fire, *June 13*, 1501.

Murphy, Mr. J. [Kerry, E.]
  Hurley Estate, Sale of—Arrangement as to Turbary Rights, *June 13*, 1493.
  Killorglin, Evicted Tenant at, Securing Re-instatement of, *May 19*, 365.
  Land Purchase—Education Commissioners' Estates — Granting Return showing Rentals, Receipts, Expenses, etc., *May 17*, 42–43.
  National School Teachers—Reduction of Average from Sixty to Fifty—Date of coming into Effect, *May 19*, 365.
  Tralee and Dingle Railway, Terms of Agreement as to, Submitting, to the County Council, *June 7*, 930.

Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G.—*Secretary for Scotland* [Buteshire]
  Deaths in the Highlands, Large proportion of uncertified, *May 19*, 419.

[*cont.*

Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G.—*cont.*
- Durness, Sutherland, Reason for Omission of, from Parochial Medical Officer's Return 1903, *June 8*, 1047.
- Education.
  - Fund.
    - Amount payable under Sub-section (3) (E) and (F) of Clause 39, *May 18*, 168.
    - Balance, approximate, per Head of average Attendance of Scholars, *May 18*, 169.
  - Schools.
    - Cummertrees—New Building in place of addition to old one, *June 8*, 1075–1076.
    - Ross-shire, Water supply for, Arrangements as to, *June 7*, 920, 929.
- Education (Scotland) Bill, *Com.*, *June 13*, 1507, 1510, 1518, 1522 1529, 1537, 1540, 1543, 1545–1548, 1551, 1554, 1555, 1579, 1585, 1586, 1588, 1590.
  - Leith and Edinburgh, Joint Area for, providing Uniform Bursary System over, *June 6*, 783.
- Lewis, Island of—Lochs, providing Grant for Construction of Footpaths in District of, *May 19*, 362-363.
- Lymph.
  - Central Vaccine Institution, Supply to—Using glycerinated in place of humanised lymph, *June 8*, 1075.
  - Humanised Calf, Success of, compared with that of glycerinated, drawing attention of Local Officers to, *June 8*, 1074.
- Perth Quarter Sessions—Justices, etc., Number of, to be summoned, *June 9*, 1209.
- Poor Law Medical Relief, Report of Departmental Committee on, *June 6*, 783; *June 7*, 920.
- Ross-shire.
  - Hospital Accommodation, Need of, Decision of Local Government Board with regard to, *June 7*, 929.
  - Water Supply for Schools in, Arrangements as to, *June 7*, 920, 929.

Museums
- Victoria and Albert—Building—number of men employed.
  - *Q.* Sir H. Fowler; *A.* Lord Balcarres, *June 9*, 1205.

Musical Copyright Bill
- *c. Con.*, *June 10*, 1372.
- *Debate on Consideration* [Commons] *June 10*, 1372.
  - Act of 1902, Repeal of—Clause as to, added to the Bill, 1372, 1373.

Musical Copyright Bill—*cont.*
- *Debate on Consideration, &c.*—*cont.*
  - Assignments of Copyright, Registration of—Clause added to the Bill, 1386–1389.
  - "Carries about," Interpretation of—Omission of Words, proposed, 1410–1412.
  - Clause 1, Deletion of, proposed, 1403-1405.
  - Composers, Loss suffered by, owing to Piracies, 1408.
  - Definition of "Musical Copyright"—Clause as to, added to the Bill, 1374.
  - Discretion of Court as regards Fines and Costs—New Clause proposed, 1390–1392, 1394–1396, 1398–1400.
  - Duration of Copyright, Settlement of, 1376.
  - Limitation of the Act—Clause as to, added to the Bill, 1374.
  - Price charged for Music, Protection of the Public, etc., 1390–1393, 1396, 1397, 1399, 1404, 1406–1408.
  - "Purposes of Sale," Meaning of, 1416.
  - Registration of Copyright within one month of Publication, making Compulsory, proposed, 1375, 1376, 1378–1386.
  - Seizure of Pirated Copies—Clause as to, added to the Bill, 1373.
  - True Name and Abode of Author, Composer and Owner of Copyright, Registration of, 1376-1378, 1382.

Muskerry, Lord
- Merchant Shipping—Coasting Trade.
  - Philippine Islands, Application of United States Coastwise Laws to *June 13*, 1454-1456.
  - Practice of other Maritime Countrie in reserving to Vessels of their own Nationality, *June 13*, 1454, 1456.

Nannetti, Mr. J. P. [Dublin, College Green]
- Dublin
  - Soldiers, Prohibition of, from walking in Main Streets, alleged, *June 13*, 1482.
  - Telegraph Office — Public Cross-Examination of Officials, *May 19*, 349.
- Ennis Postmastership—Date of becoming Vacant—Advertising in Post Office Circular, *May 19*, 349.
- Income Tax, Ireland—Increase in Salaries of Officials, proposed, *June 13*, 1474.
- Tralee and Dingle Railway, Terms of Agreement as to, Submitting, to the House, *June 7*, 929.

National Debt
Comparison with Debts of Continental Countries and the United States.
O. Mr. Cust, *May 17*, 125, 126.
Funded and Unfunded Debt, Amounts of, etc.
O. Sir W. Harcourt, *May 17*, 67.
Interest on, Amount of, References to, in Debate on the Finance Bill, *May 17*, 68, 133.
Position of—Increase in Indebtedness, etc., References to, in Debate on the Finance Bill, *May 17*, 67, 68, 90, 125, 133, 143.
Reduction of—Sinking Funds—Account presented, *June 3*, 717.

National Expenditure
See Revenue and Expenditure.

National Portrait Gallery
Report (Annual) of Trustees, presented, *May 31*, 424; *June 9*, 1184.

National School Teachers, Ireland
Assistant Teachers—Reduction of Average from Sixty to Fifty.
Date of coming into Effect.
Q. Mr. Murphy; *A.* Wyndham, *May 19*, 365.
Several Assistants to one School, Making reduction in case of.
Q. Mr. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 3*, 718.
Cornahilta—Promotion Regulations.
Q. Mr. Jordan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 13*, 1492.
Pension Fund—Accounts (Annual) presented, *June 1*, 493; *June 9*, 1185.
Salaries.
Increments, Statistics and Regulations as to.
Q. Mr. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 6*, 784-785.
Inequality as to Increases of.
Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 17*, 36.
School Attendance Committees, Appointment as Secretaries of, Approval of the Board to, etc.
Q. Mr. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 3*, 719.
Standard Numbers for different Grades, Responsibility for fixing—Inter-grade Teachers.
Q. Mr. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 6*, 784.

Naturalisation Certificates
Fees for, Proposed Reduction of.
Q. Mr. Shackleton; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *May 17*, 33.

Naval and Military Medals Bill
l. 1R.* *June 10*, 1327.

Naval Works (Portsmouth Barracks Site) Bill
c. 1R.* *May 17*, 47.

Navy
First Lord—Earl of Selborne.
Financial Secretary—Mr. E. G. Pretyman.
Battleships—Armour required for Ships of 1903 Programme — Date of issuing Tenders.
Q. Mr. J. F. Hope; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *May 19*, 345.
Chilian Battleships, purchase of, Increase in Estimates due to.
O. Mr. Elliott, *May 17*, 110.
Dockyards, *see that title.*
"Enchantress," Admiralty Yacht—Cost, Speed Trials, coal consumption, etc.
Qs. Mr. G. Bowles; *As.* Mr. Pretyman, *June 9*, 1210; *June 13*, 1467, 1468.
Expenditure.
Colonies and Dependencies, Contributions from—Return ordered, *May 17*, 30.
Increase in, References to, in debate on the Finance Bill, *May 17*, 58, 64, 65, 74, 85, 86, 95, 110, 124, 139, 147.
Foreign Navies.
Expenditure by France, Germany, and Russia, compared with that of Great Britain. References to, in debate on the Finance Bill, *May 17*, 65, 86, 87, 98.
Expenditure, normal annual, of France, Germany and Russia for each of past Twenty-five years, etc.
Qs. Mr. Runciman; *As.* Mr. Pretyman, *May 18*, 169; *June 8*, 1045-1046.
Q. Mr. Runciman; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *June 1*, 497.
Gunnery, Date of tabling Return on.
Q. Mr. S. Ormsby-Gore; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *June 8*, 1056-1057.
Pensions.
Greenwich Hospital Age Pensions, Shortage in—Assimilating Naval to Army System.
Q. Sir C. Rasch; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *May 17*, 35-36.
Special, Cases of non-Award to Applicants over Sixty-five of good character, etc.—Case of Mr. Fife.
Q. Sir C. Rasch; *A.* Mr. A. Lee, *June 6*, 787.
Rocket and Line Apparatus, supplying, to Ships of War.
Q. Mr. Massey-Mainwaring; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *May 18*, 169.
Salvage work—British Companies, Employment of, proposed — Reason for Employment of Swedish Company, &c.
Q. Sir J. Leng; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *June 13*, 1469.

[*cont.*

Navy—*cont.*
  Submarine A. 1., Loss of.
    Inquiry into, Date of tabling Report of.
      Q. Mr. E. Robertson; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *June 8*, 1056.
      Qs. Mr. E. Robertson, Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *June 13*, 1479.
    Salvage operations—Reason for Employing Swedish Company, Cause of delay in operations, etc.
      Q. Sir J. Leng; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *June 13*, 1469.
  "Thistle" Launch, Sinking of, Cause of, Salvage Operations, etc.
      Qs. Sir J. Leng, Capt. Donelan; *As.* Mr. Pretyman, *June 9*, 1213–1214.
  Torpedo Boat Destroyers—Number built and launched since 1 Jan., 1902—Return ordered, *June 1*, 612.
  Training Vessel, Arranging for Western Highlands to be visited by.
      Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *June 7*, 922–923.
  Two-Power Standard, Abandonment of, in favour of a Three-power Standard, References to, in Debate on the Finance Bill, *May 17*, 86, 87, 95–97, 138, 146.
  "Undaunted," H.M.S., Firing of Heavy Guns off Torbay by, Nuisance caused by, Taking Steps to Minimise.
      Q. Sir J. Kennaway; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *June 6*, 777.

Navy Estimates
  Surpluses on one Vote applied to Reduction of another Vote—Objections to System.
      Os. Mr. Goddard, *May 17*, 129, 130.

Nenagh, Tipperary
  Telephone Service, Extension of, proposed.
      Os. Mr. P. J. O'Brien; *As.* Lord Stanley, *June 8*, 1050; June *13*, 1471.

New Hebrides
  British and French Jurisdiction of—Settlement of, under Anglo-French Convention.
      O. Earl Percy, *June 1*, 502.

New River Company
  Appeal Case of, Postponing Appointed Day under London Water Act pending Settlement of.
      Q. Col. Bowles; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *June 2*, 618.

New River Company Bill
  c. Rep.* *June 2*, 615.
    *Con.** *June 13*, 1461.

New Writs for Parliamentary Elections
  Cavan, County of (West Cavan), *May 31*, 437.
  Devonport, Borough of, *June 9*, 1234.
  Leicester (South or Harborough Division), *June 6*, 807.

Newcastle and Gateshead Water Bill
  l. Report of Select Committee, *May 19*, 305.
    3R.* *June 9*, 1182.
  c. 1R.* *June 13*, 1463.

Newcastle-upon-Tyne Corporation Bill
  c. 1R.* *May 17*, 27.

Newchwang
  Evacuation of, by the Russians—Steps taken to Safeguard Lives and Property of British Subjects.
      Os. Mr. J. Walton, *May 19*, 390, 391; Earl Percy, 410.

Newfoundland
  Arbitration Treaty between Great Britain and France, *see under* France.

Newhaven
  Custom house at—Inconvenient Arrangements as to Inspection of Luggage.
      Os. Mr. C. Hay, *May 31*, 439; Mr. V. Cavendish, 442; Mr. J. F. Hope, 443; Mr. Maconochie, 444.

Nigeria
  British and French, Re-adjustment of Boundaries between—Terms of Anglo-French Agreement.
      O. Earl Percy, *June 1*, 501.
  Revenue and Expenditure, and Trade, from 1900—Statement presented, *June 6*, 775; *June 7*, 910.

Nolan, Col. J. P. [Galway, N.]
  Army Corps, Number of, in Great Britain and Ireland, *June 6*, 789.
  Education Board Provisional Orders (Cardiff and Newport, Monmouthshire) Bill, 2R., *June 13*, 1564.
  India—Competitive Examinations for Public Offices, Abolition of—Application of Rule to Natives—Patronage Regulations, *June 6*, 794.
  Galway
    Docks—Lighting Improvement, Authority responsible for Cost of, *June 2*, 628.
    Drainage of the County, Reports as to—Obtaining Engineer's Report, *June 6*, 803–804.

Nolan, Mr. J. [Louth, S.]
  Army Pensions
    Meath, M., Case of—Reason for Non-Award of Pension, *May 19*, 353–354.
    Privates and Non-Commissioned Officers discharged on Pension after Twenty-one Years' Service—Numbers, etc., *May 19*, 354.

Norman, Mr. H. [Wolverhampton, S.]
Aliens Bill—Motion to commit to Standing Committee on Law, *June 8*, 1106.
Divisions—Names of Members ticked off as having taken part when no division taken, *June 2*, 709.

North British Railway (General Powers) Order Confirmation Bill
c. 1R.* *June 1*, 489.
Con. * *June 3*, 714.
3R.* *June 6*, 773.
l. 1R.* and 2R.* *June 7*, 906, 907.

North Staffordshire Railway Bill
l. Report from Select Committee, *May 17*, 2.
3R.* *June 7*, 906.
c. Lords' Amendments *Con.* **June 13*, 1461.

North Wales Electric Power Bill
l. 3R.* *May 17*, 2.
c. 1R.* *May 17*, 27.
2R.* *June 7*, 914.

North Western Electricity and Power Gas Bill
Con. * *June 6*, 773.
3R.* *June 9*, 1201.
l. 1R.* *June 10*, 1326.

Northampton and District
Electric Lighting Order — Report presented *June 9*, 1205 ; *June 10*, 1327.

Norton, Captain C. W. [Newington, W.]
Army.
Enfield Small Arms Factory.
Discharged Workmen, Delay in Payment of Gratuities to, *June 13*, 1479.
Distress due to Slackness of Work at, *June 8*, 1058, 1059.
Rifles, New—Number Manufactured, Cost, etc., *June 13*, 1480.
Customs Watchers—Pay, Uniform and Holiday Grievances, *May 31*, 457-459, 460.
Penal Servitude Bill, Publication of Rules under, by *The Times*, before issuing to Members, *June 8*, 1081.
Shop Hours Bill, 2R. *June 1*, 578.
Telegraph Service—Cycle allowance of 2d. a Mile to Linemen — Continuing Allowance, *June 6*, 797.

Nuneaton and Chilvers Coton Urban District Council Bill
c. 3R.* *May 19*, 338.
l. Commons' Amendts., *Con.* **May 19*, 307.

Nursing
Select Committee on, Setting Up—State Registration of Nurses.
Q. Mr. Tennant ; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 6*, 805.

Nursing—*cont.*
Soldiers' Wives and Families in Places unprovided with Hospitals, Suggestions as to providing Nursing for.
Q. Sir J. Colomb ; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *June 6*, 786-787.
Workhouses, Sick Poor in—Local Government Board Order — Ascertaining opinions of Board of Guardians and Furnishing Draft to Poor Law Unions Association, proposed.
Q. Sir H. Samuel ; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *June 13*, 1472.

Nussey Mr. T. W. [Pontefract]
Licensing Bill, *Com. June 6*, 898.
Motor Cars in London—Person responsible for Regulation of Traffic, *June 2*, 636.
Postal Guide—Sunday Deliveries, etc.—Additional Information, proposed, *June 9*, 1207.

O'Brien, Mr. P. [Kilkenny]
Divisions challenged frivolously—Precedent for claiming, irrespective of numbers, *June 2*, 708.
Public Trustee for Ireland, Opening of Office of — Appointing Assistants, *May 19*, 351.

O'Brien, Mr. P. J. [Tipperary, N.]
Blake, Mrs. Helen, Estate of, Tracing heirs to, etc., *June 8*, 1049 ; *June 13*, 1491.
Nenagh, Extension of Telephone Service to, proposed, *June 8*, 1050 ; *June 13*, 1471.

O'Connor, Mr. J. [Wicklow, W.]
Cork Post Office Examinations—Restrictions as to Candidates, *June 13*, 1470.
Fitzwilliam, Earl, Ejectment Processes served to Tenants of, etc., *June 2*, 624-625 ; *June 6*, 803.
Kilbride Camp Canteen Licence, Order for, signed by Two Magistrates in Opposition to their Colleagues, Validity of, etc., *June 2*, 625-626 ; *June 6*, 802.
Public Buildings, Irish—Insurance against fire, *June 13*, 1501.
Second-Term Rent — Case of Mr. H. Halpin, of Whitestown, *May 18*, 171.
Transvaal, Introduction of Chinese Labour to — Compelling Sunday Labour, *May 18*, 176.

O'Connor, Mr. T. P. [Liverpool, Scotland]
Finance Bill, 2R., *May 18*, 240.
Land Act, Working of—Obstruction by Trinity College and the landlords, etc., *May 19*, 404-406.
Taxation of Ireland, *May 18*, 240-242.

O'Doherty, Mr. W. [Donegal, S.]
Arryheera Coastguard Station, *June 6*, 777-778.
Buncrana Pier, Inadequacy of, *May 19*, 343-344

[*cont.*

O'Doherty, Mr. W.—*cont.*
Donegal Landlords agreeing to sell under Land Act, 1903, *June 6*, 783.
Education
New Code — Examination Papers, Settlement of, by Committee of Three, *June 8*, 1053.
Teachers of Evening Classes in Donegal, Fees due to, *June 8*, 1054.
Irish Society, Sale of Londonderry Estates of, *June 7*, 930, 931.

O'Donnell, Mr. T. [Kerry, W.]
Kerry, Number and Names of Landlords agreeing to sell Estates in—Valuation, Rentals, etc., of Estates, *May 17*, 32.

Official Secrets Bill, India
Points objected to by Members of Select Committee.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *May 19*, 350.

Omagh
Post Office, Duty of arranging Overtime at.
Q. Mr. Joyce; *A.* Lord Stanley, *June 7*, 932.

Onslow, Earl of—*President of the Board of Agriculture.*
Agricultural produce and railway rates—Committee appointed to consider, *June 9*, 1197-1200
Crown Agents—Remuneration and method of transacting business—Appointment of Committee of Inquiry into, proposed, *June 10*, 1361-1363.
Railway Rates and Transit facilities.
Agricultural produce.
Local Conferences in cases of dispute between Agriculturists and Railway Companies, *June 9*, 1199.
Preferential Rates to foreign goods—Committee of Inquiry—Constitution and terms of reference of, *June 9*, 1198, 1199.
Milk—Conditions of carriage, Insanitary state of vans, etc., *June 9*, 1199, 1200.

Ophthalmia
Poor Law Children suffering from—Statistics as to.
Q. Sir W. Foster; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *June 13*, 1471, 1472.

Orange River Colony
Finance — Information as to present position.
Q. Mr. Whitley; *A.* Mr. Lyttleton, *June 9*, 1220.

Oranmore and Browne, Lord
Land Act, Working of — Agitation and Intimidation by the United Irish League, etc., *June 13*, 1431.

Ormsby-Gore, Mr. G. R. C. [Shropshire, Oswestry]
Army—Powder, New Government, Results of, compared with those of Cordite 1901 and 1902, *June 8*, 1058.
Lincoln and Scawby Light Railway Scheme, Promotion of, *June 8*, 1071, 1072.
Morocco, Tabling Communications with, as to Anglo-French Agreement, *June 8*, 1064.
Navy—Gunnery, Date of Tabling Return on, *June 8*, 1056-1057.
Roberts, Lord—Pay, Reasons for continuing, *June 9*, 1214.
Transvaal, Importation of Chinese Labour to.
Natives liberated for Agricultural Purposes by, Estimated number of, *June 8*, 1060-1061.
White Labour, Effect on—Class of Work open to the Chinese, etc., *June 9*, 1216.
Vagrancy Acts, Suggested Amendment of, *May 18*, 179.
Volunteers, Vote for, Date of taking, etc., *June 8*, 1079.

OutDoor Relief (Friendly Societies) (No 3) Bill
c. Order for Second Reading—Bill withdrawn, *June 3*, 771.

Oxenfoord, Lord
Sat first in Parliament after the death of his father, *June 10*, 1325.

Oxford
Telegraph Office — Compelling Staff to perform Postal Duties.
Q. Mr. W. Jones; *A.* Lord Stanley, *June 6*, 780.
University of—Trinity College—Statute amending Statute VI. Presented, *June 8*, 1044; *June 9*, 1185.

Oxford St. Post Office (No. 10)
Sanitary Condition, Improvement in, etc.
Q. Mr. Bayley; *A.* Lord Stanley, *June 9*, 1206.

Paisley District Tramways Order Confirmation Bill
c. 1R.* *May 19*, 339.
*Con.** *May 31*, 421.
3R.* *June 2*, 614.
l. 1R.* and 2R.* *June 7*, 907.

Parker, Sir G. [Gravesend]
Post Office.
Australia, Introducing Penny Post to, *June 8*, 1069.
Magazine Rates to and from the Colonies, Proposed Reduction of, *June 8*, 1069.
Sorting of News letters in red covers addressed to Editors of London Newspapers; Carelessness as to, *June 8*, 1068.

Parliament
House of Commons.
Business of the House, *see that title.*
Committees, *see that title.*
Divisions, *see that title.*
Standing Orders, *see that title.*
Whitsuntide, Adjournment for.
Motion [Sir A. Acland-Hood] *May 19*, 369.
House of Lords.
Fee Fund — Account presented, *May 31*, 424.
Representative Peer for Ireland — Viscount de Vesci, Right of, to Vote at Elections established, *June 13*, 1417.
Sat First—Lord Oxenfoord, after the death of his father, *June 10*, 1325.
Standing Orders, *see that title.*

Parliamentary Elections
New Writs, *see that title.*
Stafford — Alteration in Handsworth Polling District, Order presented, *June 6*, 776 ; *June 7*, 912.
Warwickshire — Alterations in Polling Districts, Order presented, *June 1*, 493 ; *June 7*, 912.
Yorks, West Riding of—Alteration in Hallamshire Polling District, Order presented, *June 6*, 776 ; *June 7*, 912.

Parliamentary Procedure
New Rules.
Blocking Motions—Taking steps to prevent.
Os. Mr. G. Bowles, *May 19*, 379, 380, 382 ; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, 382, 383 ; Sir C. Dilke, 383 ; Mr. H. Samuel, 387 ; Mr. Lloyd-George, 397, 398 ; Mr. Bryce, 415 ; Mr. J. A. Pease, *June 9*, 1229 ; Mr. Balfour, 1230-1232 ; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, 1231, Maj. Seely, Mr. MacVeagh, 1232.
Qs. Mr. Malcolm, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman,, Mr. G. Bowles ; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 2*, 628-630.
Consideration of, Date of resuming.
Q Mr. Whitly ; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *May 17*, 37, 38.
Criticism on Estimates, etc., hampered by.
Os. Mr. Robson, *May 17*, 102, 104 ; Mr. Goddard, 128, 129.
Debate, Initiative of, confined to the Government,
O. Mr. G. Bowles, *May 19*, 379, 380.
Evening Sitting, Division of, into two parts, Advantages and disadvantages of.
Os. Mr. A. J. Balfour, *May 19*, 374 ; Mr. G. Bowles, 378 ; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, 381.

Parliamentary Procedure—*cont.*
New Rules—*cont.*
Friday Arrangement, Advantages of.
Os. Mr. A. J. Balfour, *May 19*, 372, 373 ; Mr. G. Bowles, 377.
Hour of meeting, Objections to.
Os. Dr. Farquharson, *May 19*, 369 ; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 371, 373 ; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, 381.
Inadequant sources of information to Members.
Os. Mr. A. J. Balfour, *May 19*, 374; Mr. G. Bowles, 375-377.
Length of Speeches made by Members the reason of protracted sittings.
O. Mr. A. J. Balfour, *May 19*, 371, 372.
Private Members' rights, Curtailment of, under.
O. Mr. G. Bowles, *May 19*, 379, 380.
Working of, Appointment of Committee of Inquiry into, proposed.
Os. Dr. Farquharson, *May 19*, 369 ; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 370, 374, 375 ; Mr. Bowles, 377, 380 ; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, 380 ; Sir C. Dilke, 383.

Parks and Gardens
Kensington Gardens.
Fountains in, Reason for stoppage of.
Q. Mr. Coghill ; *A.* Lord Balcarres, *May 17*, 33-34.
Sand Ride in, proposed.
Q. Lord Cecil Manners ; *A.* Lord Balcarres, *June 8*, 1050.
Motor Cars, Regulations for, speed limit, &c.
Qs. Mr. C. Wason, Dr. Farquharson ; *As.* Lord Balcarres, *June 9*, 1225, 1226.
Richmond Park, Removing Dead Limbs and Branches from aged Oak Trees in.
Q. Mr. J. Hutton ; *A.* Lord Balcarres, *June 6*, 781-782.

Paupers
See Poor Law.

Pease, Mr. J. A. [Essex, Saffron Walden]
Aliens Bill—Motion to Commit to Standing Committee on Law, *June 8*, 1121.
Beer, Home-made, Licence required for Brewing—Regulations as to Employment of Assistance, *June 8*, 1052.
Education (Scotland) Bill, *Com.*, *June 13*, 1590.
Macedonian Reforms, Progress of, *May 19*, 396.
Parliamentary Procedure—New Rules—Blocking Motions, Opportunities for Debate curtailed by, *June 9*, 1229.
Shop Hours Bill, 2R., *June 1*, 602.
Transvaal, Importation of Chinese Labour to—Powers of Chinese Consul, *June 9*, 1215, 1216.

Pemba, Island of

Administration of, Transferring from Foreign to Colonial Office.
Q. Mr. Bayley; *A.* Earl Percy, *June 7*, 927.

Slavery in—Slave's right to hold Property, Ruling of Zanzibar Commissioner as to—Steps to be taken.
Q. Mr. Bayley; *A.* Earl Percy, *June 8*, 1063-1064.

Pemberton, Mr. J. S. G. [Sunderland]

London County Council (Tramways and Improvements) Bill, *Com.*, *June 9*, 1312.

Penal Servitude Bill

c. 2R. *June 3*, 722.

Debate on Second Reading [Commons], *June 3*, 722.

"Bad Characters," Definition of, 731, 765.

Classification of Convicts, and Special Treatment, proposed, 726, 739, 743, 744, 749, 752, 759, 767.

Departmental Committee of 1894, Report and Recommendations of, 722, 723, 734, 735, 759.

First Offenders, Improvement of, Efforts as to, 742, 746, 755, 766, 768.

Habitual Criminals.

Class of Previous Convictions to be taken into account, proposed, 735, 736, 738, 768.

Determination of, to be left to the discretion of the Judges, 727, 728, 730, 731, 736, 739, 746, 747, 750, 756, 763, 765.

Difficulty of obtaining honest Employment after serving a sentence the cause of, 729, 743, 758, 767.

Evidence as to Prisoner's Life, etc.—Allowing Defence on the part of the Prisoner, 730, 736, 739, 747, 748, 758.

Keeping under Permanent Control, proposed, 747.

Longer and Lighter Sentences for, proposed, 722, 723, 726, 729, 730, 733, 742, 756, 758, 759, 762.

Period of Punishment, Limiting Right of Imposing Terms to Judges of the High Court, proposed, 734, 735.

Proportion of — Statistics, 725, 733, 740, 741.

Ticket of Leave, Withdrawal of Right to earn, 733, 734, 757, 760, 761.

Transportation of, proposed, 754.

Treatment of, Absence of Information as to, 745, 751, 768.

Penal Servitude Bill—*cont.*

Debate on Second Reading—cont.

Judges of King's Bench Division, Resolution passed by, 724.

Physical and Industrial Training in Prisons, Development of, proposed, 742, 744, 746, 753-755.

Referring to Standing Committee on Law, proposed, 728, 732, 738, 763.

Rules applicable to Prison Procedure —Tabling, proposed, 737, 738, 743.

Sentences.

Common Standard in Regard to, proposed, 750, 760, 761.

Home Office Revision of, 742, 750, 756.

Ticket of Leave.

Forfeiture of Licence—Objections to Proposed new Conditions, 731, 758, 764.

Withdrawal of Right to earn, in the case of Habitual Criminals, 733, 734, 757, 760, 761.

Rules under, Publication of, by *The Times* before issuing to Members, Government Action as to.
Qs. Mr. Lough, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Capt. Norton; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *June 8*, 1080-1081.

Peninsular and Oriental Steamship Company

Mail Service Contract with, Renewal of—Allowing opportunity for Discussion.
Q. Mr. H. C. Richards; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 31*, 428-429.

Pensions

Army and Navy, *see under those titles.*

Percy, Earl—*Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs* [Kensington, S.]

Africa, East, British Protectorate.

Administration of, Date of Transferring from Foreign to Colonial Office, *June 7*, 926, 927.

Alienation of Territory in, alleged, *June 9*, 1222, 1295, 1296, 1319.

Jewish Settlement, Proposed Cession of Territory for — Appointing Independent Commission of Inquiry, *May 17*, 39.

Anglo-French Convention Bill, 2R., *June 1*, 499-516, 532, 551.

Armenia.

Condition of—Steps taken to prevent Outrages, etc., *May 19*, 411, 412; *June 6*, 795, 796; *June 9*, 1321.

British North Borneo Company, Alleged illegal arrest by, *May 17*, 33.

[*cont.*

Percy, Earl—*cont.*
- China.
  - Commercial Treaty with Great Britain, Scope of, *May 19*, 411.
  - Newchwang, Evacuation of, by Russia—Steps taken to Safeguard Lives and Property of British Subjects, *May 19*, 410.
  - Railway Concessions in—Delay in commencement of Work by the British-China Corporation, *May 19*, 410.
- Congo Free State.
  - Administration of, by the Belgian Government, Treatment of Natives, etc., *June 9*, 1272-1285.
  - Consular Court for Protection of British Subjects, Establishing, *May 19*, 350.
  - Jones, Silvanus, Case of, *May 18*, 178.
- Germany, Russian Agreement with, as to Customs Duties, *June 8*, 1063.
- Macedonia.
  - Civil Assessors, Work of, *May 19*, 413, Failure to render Reports, etc., *June 7*, 926; *June 9*, 1321.
    - Tours made by—Tabling Reports from, *June 7*, 926.
  - Gendarmerie, Re-organisation of, under European Officers.
    - Belgian and Swedish Officers, Numbers, Duties, etc., of, *June 8*, 1047.
    - British Officers serving with Gendarmerie, and Foreign Staff Officers, Names of, *June 8*, 1048.
    - Giorgis, General, Tabling Proposals of, etc., *June 7*, 925-926.
    - Progress of the Scheme, *May 19*, 412, 413; *June 9*, 1321.
  - Refugees from, Repatriation of, Arrangements made by Turkish and Bulgarian Governments for, *June 7*, 925.
- Mecca, Pilgrims to, Protection for, *June 7*, 925.
- Morocco.
  - Anglo-French Agreement, Tabling communications regarding, *June 8*, 1064.
  - Franco-Spanish Agreement as to, Tabling, *June 8*, 1064.
- Pemba, Island of
  - Administration of, Transferring, from Foreign to Colonial Office, *June 7*, 927.
  - Slavery in—Slave's right to hold Property, Ruling of Zanzibar Commissioner as to, *June 8*. 1063.
- Russia, German Agreement with, as to Customs Duties, *June 8*, 1063.

Percy, Earl—*cont.*
- Russo-Japanese War—Naval Mines outside Territorial Limits, *June 2*, 623.
- Somaliland Campaign, Total cost of, prior to 1st October 1902, *June 8*, 1048.
- Sugar—Brussels Convention.
  - Countervailing duties imposed on Self-governing Colonies, *June 9*, 1320; *June 13*, 1488, 1489.
  - Papers relating to, Inaccuracy of, *June 9*, 1319; *June 13*, 1488.
  - Procés Verbal, Tabling, *June 9*, 1319.
  - Sugared products, Application of the Convention to, *June 9*, 1320; *June 13*, 1488, 1489.
- Tea, Indian, Importation of, into Persia—Effect of new Persian duty, *June 13*, 1488.
- Tibet Expedition—Advance to Lhasa, Chinese assent to, *May 19*, 358, 359.
- Uganda, Administration of, Date of transferring, from Foreign to Colonial Office, *June 7*, 926, 927.
- Zanzibar, Administration of, transferring, from Foreign to Colonial Office, *June 7*, 927.

Perks, Mr. R. W. [Lincolnshire, Louth]
- Aliens Bill—Expenses, Resolution as to *June 8*, 1140.

Persia
- Anglo-Russian negotiations as to,
  - *Q.* Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 13*, 1502.
- Tea Duty, Effect of, on importation of Indian Tea into Persia.
  - *Q.* Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Earl Percy, *June 13*, 1487, 1488.
- Trade Report, Presented, *May 19*, 308.

Persian Gulf
- Trade Report, Presented, *June 10*, 1326.

Perth
- Quarter Sessions—Justices and members of Licensing Courts, number of, to be summoned.
  - *Q.* Mr. Buchanan; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *June 9*, 1209.

Petitions
- Public Petitions Committee—Report Presented, *May 18*, 185; *June 8*, 1083.
- Standing Orders 39, 128, and 230, Suspension of, *May 19*, 338.

Philippine Islands
- Coastwise Laws of the United States, application of, to—Representations on the part of H.M. Government.
  - *Qs.* Lord Muskerry, *June 13*, 1454-1456; Marquess of Lansdowne, 1458, 1459.

Phosphorus Poisoning

Bryant and May, Death of Employee of, from Phossy Jaw, making Investigation as to.
Qs. Mr. Crooks, Sir C. Dilke; *As.* Mr. A. Douglas, *June 8*, 1065–1066.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 1) Bill

l. 3R.* *May 19*, 307.
c. 1R.* *May 19*, 339.

Nature of Proposals.

Memorandum ordered, *June 3*, 714; Presented *June 6*, 776.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill

c. 1R.* *May 18*, 157.

Nature of Proposals.

Memorandum Ordered *June 3*, 714; Presented *June 6*, 777.

Piers and Harbours

Cornwall, Construction of Harbour of Refuge proposed — Memorandum Presented, *May 18*, 159; *May 19*, 309.

Cornwall or North Devon, Harbour of Refuge on Coast of, Names of Local Authorities making Representations as to.
Q. Mr. Soares; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *June 8*, 1070–1071.

Harwich Conservancy Board, Receipts and Expenditure of—Accounts Presented, *June 8*, 1045; *June 9*, 1185.

Ireland.

Arklow — Report of Commissioners, Presented, *May 17*, 4, 29.

Aughris, Sligo—Completion of Pier and Boatslip.
Q. Mr. W. McKillop; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 18*, 182.

Buncrana Pier, Inadequacy of, Loss of Herrings caused by—Pier Extension.
Q. Mr. O' Doherty; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 19*, 343–344.

Pirie, Mr. D. V. [Aberdeen, N.]

Fiscal Policy—Plain Issue shirked by the Government, *June 9*, 1231.

Platt-Higgins Mr. F, [Salford, N.]

Thames River Steamboat Service Bill, *Con.*, *June 2*, 696.

Plymouth Corporation Bill

l. 2R.* *June 7*, 906.

Police

Evidence in Cases between Private Litigants, Regulations as to giving—Case of Sievier *v.* Duke.
Q. Mr. Atherley-Jones; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *May 17*, 40–41.

Police—*cont.*

Irish, *see titles* Constabulary Royal Irish, *and* Dublin—Metropolitan Police.

Metropolitan Force — Annual Leave, Length of, Allowing Fortnightly Leave to be added to.
Q. Mr. Louth; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *June 7*, 918–919.

Police Courts

Juvenile Cases, Hearing of—Separating Juvenile from Adult Offenders.
Q. Mr. Talbot; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *May 18*, 163–164.

Political Meetings

School Buildings, Public use of.
Q. Mr. Hunt; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *June 9*, 1227.

Polling Districts

Stafford—Alteration in Handsworth Parliamentary Division.
Order Presented, *June 6*, 776; *June 7*, 912.

Warwick, Alterations in County of.
Order Presented, *June 1*, 493; *June 7*, 912.

York, West Riding of—Alteration in Hallamshire Parliamentary Division.
Order Presented, *June* 6, 776; *June 7*, 912.

Poor Law

Children.

Barnet Schools, Condition of
O. Sir E. Flower, *June 2*, 639.

Barrack School System, Failure of.
Os. Sir E. Flower, *June 2*, 639–640; Sir J. Gorst, 643.

Boarding-out System.

Advantages of.
Os. Sir J. Gorst, *June 2*, 645, 646; Mr. Crooks, 649; Mr. Toulmin, 662.

Extension and Revision of Orders, proposed.
Os. Mr. Toulmin, *June 2*, 662, 663; Mr. Long, 669.

Inspection, Defects of Present System of.
Os. Sir J. Gorst, *June 2*, 646; Mr. Crooks, 649, 650.

Destitute Children sent to Industrial Schools — Objections to the System.
Os. Sir J. Gorst, *June 2*, 646; Mr. Crooks, 652.

Education of.

Elementary and Secondary Schools, Education in.
O. Mr. Crooks, *June 2*, 648.

Progress in Schools, Granting facilities for Testing, to the Board of Education, proposed.
Os. Mr. T. W. Russell, *June 2*, 659; Mr. Long, 665.

[cont.

Poor Law—*cont.*

Children—*cont.*

Canada.

Establishment of Homes or Schools in—Objections to the Scheme.
Os. Mr. H. Samuel, *June 2*, 641 ; Sir J. Gorst, 642.

Number sent to, in 1903.
Q. Mr. H. Samuel ; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *June 13*, 1473.

Emigration of, to the Colonies, proposed.
Os. Mr. H. Samuel, *June 2*, 640 ; Mr. Long, 669.

Canada, Establishment of Homes or Schools in—Objections to the Scheme.
Os. Mr. H. Samuel, *June 2*, 641 ; Sir J. Gorst, 642.

Hanwell Schools, Overcrowding in.
Os. Sir J. Gorst, *June 2*, 643 ; Mr. T. W. Russell, 658 ; Mr. W. Long, 664, 665.

Imbeciles, Improved System of Instruction for.
O. Mr. Crooks, *June 2*, 651.

Ringworm and Ophthalmia, Statistics as to.
Q. Sir W. Foster ; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *June 13*, 1471, 1472.

Scattered Homes, System of—Assimilation of Children with the Life of the Village and Removal of Workhouse taint.
Os. Sir J. Gorst, *June 2*, 644 ; Mr. Crook, 649, 650 ; Mr. Toulmin, 661.

Wigan Board of Guardians' Decision against Scattered Homes System—Action of Local Government Board.
Os. Sir J. Gorst, *June 2*, 644, 645 ; Mr. W. Long, 645, 664.

Village Communities, System of.
O. Sir J. Gorst, *June 2*, 643, 644.

West Ham Schools, Overcrowding in, etc.
O. Sir E. Flower, *June 2*, 639.

Workhouses and Infirmaries, Undesirability of Retaining in—Carrying out Recommendations of Departmental Committee of 1895.
Os. Sir J. Gorst, *June 2*, 642 ; Mr. Crooks, 651 ; Mr. Long, 663.

Expenditure—Omissions from Returns of Inspectors.
Q. Mr. Atherley-Jones ; *A.* Mr. G. Lawson, *June 13*, 1490.

Ireland.

Increase in Pauperism due to Over-Taxation.
Os. Mr. Clancy, *May 18*, 193 ; Mr. Lough, 210 ; Mr. T. W; Russell, 212.

Poor Law—*cont.*

Ireland—*cont.*

Outdoor Relief Regulations.
Q. Mr. MacVeagh ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 9*, 1228.

Officers in East End Parishes—Granting of Gratuities or Higher Salaries—Contributions from West End Parishes, proposed.
Os. Mr. Crooks, *June 2*, 652 ; Mr. Long, 666.

Scotland—Medical Relief, Report of Departmental Committee on, Steps to Carry Out Recommendations in.
Q. Mr. M. Ferguson ; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *June 6*, 783.
Qs. Mr. Tennant, Mr. C. Wason ; *A.* Mr. S. Dickson, *June 6*, 800-801.

Unions—Re-adjustment of Areas, and Uniformity of Valuation.
Q. Mr. O. Williams ; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *June 13*, 1473.

Workhouses, *see that title.*

Poor Law Officers' Superannuation (Scotland) Bill

c. 1R.* *May 17*, 48.

Port Sanitary Authority Expenses Bill

c. 1R.* *June 9*, 1235.

Portmadoc, Beddgelert, and South Snowdon Railway Bill

c. 1R.* *May 17*, 26.
2R.* *June 7*, 914.

Portrait Gallery, National

Report, Annual, of Trustees, Presented, *May 31*, 424 ; *June 9*, 1184.

Portsmouth, Earl of

Crown Agents, Remuneration and duties of—Inquiry, proposed, *June 10*, 1328 1338.

Portugal

Trade Report Presented, *June 7*, 910 ; *June 13*, 1418.

Post Office

Postmaster-General—Lord Stanley.

Astley Abbotts—Post and Telegraph Office proposed.
Q. Mr. Hunt ; *A.* Lord Stanley, *June 9*, 1226.

Collections—Weight to be conveyed by One Man with Handcart.
Q. Mr. Freeman-Thomas ; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 17*, 34.

Gratuities for Officials not entitled to Pensions.
Q. Major Jameson; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 31*, 429.

Guide, Postal—Sunday despatches and deliveries, Additional information as to, proposed.
Q. Mr. Nussey ; *A.* Lord Stanley, *June 9*, 1207.

[*cont.*

Post Office—*cont.*
Hastings.
Petition to Postmaster as to sorting of parcels at St. Leonards-on-Sea Office, Inquiry into, proposed.
Q. Mr. Freeman-Thomas; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 17*, 34-35.
Salaries of Officials, Amount of increase cf.
Q. Mr. Freeman-Thomas; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 17*, 34.
Ireland.
Belfast Messengers, Sunday remuneration of.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Lord Stanley, *June* 9, 1226, 1227.
Clones—Arrangements in new building.
Q. Mr. McKean; *A.* Lord Stanley, *June* 9, 1207.
Cork Examinations—Regulations as to restriction of candidature to persons in employ of Post Office.
Q. Mr. J. O'Connor; *A.* Lord Stanley, *June 13*, 1470, 1471.
Ennis Postmastership—Date of becoming Vacant—Advertising in Post Office Circular, etc.
Q. Mr. Nannetti; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 19*, 349.
Gratuities for Officials not entitled to Pensions—Amount to be distributed in Ireland.
Q. Major Jameson; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 31*, 429.
Kilcoo, Delay in Delivery of Letters at, Taking steps to prevent.
Q. Mr. MacVeagh; *A.* Lord Stanley, *June 2*, 627.
Omagh Office, Duty of arranging Overtime at.
Q. Mr. Joyce; *A.* Lord Stanley, *June* 7, 932.
West of Ireland to Belfast, Delay in Transmission of Mails from.
Q. Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Lord Stanley, *June 3*, 717-718.
Letters.
Kilcoo—Delays in Delivery, Prevention of
Q. Mr. MacVeagh; *A.* Lord Stanley, *June 2*, 627.
Newsletters, Careless Sorting of, at General Post Office, alleged.
Q. Sir G. Parker; *A.* Lord Stanley, *June 8*, 1068.
Sunday Despatches and Deliveries, Additional information as to, in Postal Guide, proposed.
Q. Mr. Nussey; *A.* Lord Stanley, *June 9*, 1207.
Liverpool Office—Refreshment Intervals—Granting Fifteen in lieu of Ten Minutes for Tea.
Q. Mr. Shackleton; *A.* Lord Stanley, *June 6*, 779.

Post Office—*cont.*
London.
General Post Office—Sorting of Newsletters at—Inquiry into alleged carelessness, proposed.
Q. Sir G. Parker; *A.* Lord Stanley, *June 8*, 1068.
Oxford Street (No. 10), Insanitary Condition of, alleged.
Q. Mr. Bayley; *A.* Lord Stanley, *June 9*, 1206.
Pillar Boxes in W.C. District, Inaccuracy of time plates on.
Q. Mr. H. J. Wilson; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 19*, 349, 350.
Sorter Tracers, Answering Memorial from, as to Pay and Promotion.
Q. Mr. Kimber; *A.* Lord Stanley, *June 6*, 781.
Magazine Rates to and from the Colonies, Proposed reduction of, Estimated loss of Revenue by.
Q. Sir G. Parker; *A.* Lord Stanley, *June* 8, 1069-1070.
Mail Service.
Australia, Introducing Penny Post to.
Q. Sir G. Parker; *A.* Lord Stanley, *June 8*, 1069.
Eastern—Committee Report presented, *June 9*, 1184.
Recommendations, Steps taken to give effect to.
Q. Mr. E. Cecil; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 17*, 35.
Steamship Subsidies—P. and O. Contract, Renewal of—Allowing opportunity for discussion.
Q. Mr. H. C. Richards; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 31*, 428-429.
Middlesborough—Case of Mr. Chandler, Telegraphist, etc.—Revision of Duties, proposed.
Q. Mr. Henderson; *A.* Lord Stanley, *June 13*, 1470.
Money Orders.
Sierra Leone—Regulations presented, *May 31*, 425.
Statutory Rules and Orders (1904) presented, *June 7*, 911.
Oxford Street (No. 10), Insanitary Condition of, alleged.
Q. Mr. Bayley; *A.* Lord Stanley, *June 9*, 1206.
Pillar Boxes in W.C. District—Inaccuracy of time plates.
Q. Mr. H. J. Wilson; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 19*, 349-350.
Postage.
Magazine Rates to and from the Colonies, Estimated loss of Revenue by proposed reduction.
Q. Sir G. Parker; *A.* Lord Stanley, *June 8*, 1069-1070.
[*cont.*

Post Office—*cont.*
Postage—*cont.*
Penny—Australia, Negotiations as to, *Q.* Sir G. Parker; *A.* Lord Stanley, *June 8*, 1069.
Postal Guide—Sunday Deliveries, etc., Additional information as to, proposed. *Q.* Mr. Nussey; *A.* Lord Stanley, *June 9*, 1207.
Postmasters — Ennis Postmastership — Date of becoming Vacant—Advertising in Post Office Circular, etc. *Q.* Mr. Nannetti; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 19*, 349.
Provincial Offices, Want of Vacancies for Qualified Female Learners in. *Q.* Sir J. Leng; *A.* Lord Stanley, *June 7*, 928.
Revenue and Expenditure, Increase in, since 1882. *O.* Sir H. Fowler, *May 17*, 79.
St. Leonards-on-Sea Office, Sorting of Parcels at—Petition to Hastings Postmaster, Inquiring into. *Q.* Mr. Freeman-Thomas; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 17*, 34-35.
Savings Bank, *see that title.*
Sorting of News letters, Carelessness as to, making inquiry into. *Q.* Sir G. Parker; *A.* Lord Stanley, *June 8*, 1068.
Stamps, Books of Half-penny, Suggested issue of. *Q.* Mr. E. Wason; *A.* Lord Stanley, *June 6*, 797–798.
Telegraph Service, *see that title.*
Telephone Service, *see that title.*
Wages—Sir Edward Bradford's Committee, Date of Tabling Report of. *Qs.* Sir J. Woodhouse, Mr. Bayley; *A.* Lord Stanley, *June 2*, 623–624.

Post Office Sites Bill
c. 1R.* *June 2*, 632.

Powell, Sir F. S. [Wigan]
Aliens Bill—Expenses, Resolutions as to, *June 8*, 1148.
Education Board Provisional Orders (Cardiff and Newport Monmouthshire) Bill, 2R., *June 13*, 1560.
Musical Copyright Bill, *Con.*, *June 10*, 1388.
Shop Hours Bill, 2R., *June 1*, 588.

Power, Mr. P. J. [Waterford, E.]
Education Board Provisional Orders (Cardiff and Newport Monmouthshire) Bill, 2R., *June 13*, 1560.
Finance Bill, 2R. *May 18*, 224.
Taxation of Ireland — Protests against Over-taxation, etc., *May 18*, 224–227.

President of the Board of Agriculture
Earl of Onslow.

President of the Board of Education
Marquess of Londonderry.

President of the Board of Trade
Mr. Gerald Balfour.

President of the Local Government Board
Mr. Walter H. Long.

Preston, Chorley & Horwich Tramways Bill
c. Rep.* *June 13*, 1463.

Preston Corporation Water Bill
c. 1R.* *May 17*, 27.
2R.* *June 7*, 914.

Pretyman, Capt. E. G.—*Secretary to the Admiralty* [Suffolk, Woodbridge]
Battleships—Armour Required for Ships of 1903 Programme—Date of issuing Tenders, *May 19*, 345.
Coastguard Service, Ireland—Arryheera, Donegal, Cause of Delay in Erection of Station at, *June 6*, 778.
Devonport Dockyard—Piecework System, Introduction of—Effect on number of men employed, *June 13*, 1469.
"Enchantress" Yacht—Cost, Speed Trials, Coal Consumption, etc., *June 9*, 1210; *June 13*, 1467, 1468.
Foreign Navies — Expenditure, Normal Annual of France, Germany and Russia in each of past twenty-five years, *May 18*, 169; *June 8*, 1046.
Gunnery, Date of Tabling Return on, *June 8*, 1056–1057.
Pensions—Greenwich Hospital Age Pensions, Shortage in, *May 17*, 36.
Rocket and Line Apparatus, Supplying, to Ships of War, *May 18*, 169.
Salvage Work—British Firms, Employment of, proposed, *June 13*, 1469.
South African War—Transports, Date of Tabling Return as to, *June 8*, 1049.
Submarine A1, Loss of.
Inquiry into, Tabling Report of, *June 8*, 1056; *June 13*, 1479.
Salvage Operations—Cause of Delay, Reason for Employing Swedish firm, &c., *June 13*, 1469.
"Thistle" Launch — Sinking, Cause of, Salvage Operations, &c., *June 9*, 1213, 1214.
Torbay, Heavy Gun firing off, Taking Steps to minimise Annoyance caused by, *June 6*, 777.
Training Vessel, Arranging for Western Highlands to be visited by, *June 7*, 922–923.

Prevention of Corruption Bill
l. Rep.* *May 17*, 5.
3R.* *May 19*, 309.
Date of Second Reading. *Q.* Mr. Channing; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 7*, 922.

Prime Minister
Mr. A. J. Balfour

Prisons
Convict—Proposed New Rules—Draft Presented, *June 7*, 912, 918.

Privileges, Committee of
Nomination of Members Proposed.
Q. Mr. G. Bowles ; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 13*, 1502, 1503.

Prize Courts Bill
l. Rep.* *May 17*, 5.
3R.* *May 19*, 309.

Protection v. Free Trade
See Fiscal Policy.

Public Accounts Committee
Report Presented, *June 10*, 1365.

Public Entertainment Bill
c. 1R.* *June 9*, 1235.

Public Petitions
See Petitions.

Public Works Loan
Extension of Time of Repayment.
Q. Mr. Crooks ; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *May 19*, 355.

Quarries
Cornwall—Health of Miners—Report Presented, *May 31*, 423 ; *June 7*, 908.
Foreign and Colonial—General Report and Statistics Presented, *May 17*, 4, 28.
United Kingdom—Report and Statistics (1903) Presented, *June 2*, 618 ; *June 7*, 908, 911, 918.

Quit and Crown Rents, Ireland
Redemption of—Terms under Ashbourne and Land Acts of 1896 and 1903.
Q. Mr. Gilhooly ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 18*, 183.

Radcliffe Tramways and Improvement Bill
c. *Con.** *May 31*, 421.
3R.* *June 3*, 713.
l. 1R.* *June 7*, 906.

Railways
Accidents—General Report, Presented, *May 17*, 4, 28
Bye-laws—Securing uniformity of, all over the Kingdom, proposed,
O. Mr. Weir, *June 2*, 711.
Electric Underground—Steps taken to protect passengers.
O. Mr. Weir, *June 2*, 712.
Ireland.
Employees and Benefit Societies—Conditions imposed by Companies, etc.
Q. Mr. Lundon ; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *June 9*, 1224.

Railways—*cont.*
Ireland—*cont*
Statistics Presented, *May 31*, 426 ; *June 7*, 909.
Tralee and Dingle, Negotiations as to—Submitting Terms of Agreement to the House.
Qs. Mr. Field, Mr. Nannetti, Mr. Murphy ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 7*, 929-930.
Light.
Highlands of Scotland, Construction in.
O. Mr. Weir, *June 2*, 710.
Lincoln and Scawby, promoting between—Recommending Exchequer Contribution.
Q. Mr. S. Ormsby-Gore ; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *June 8*, 1071-1072.
Overcrowding of Carriages—Steps taken by the Board of Trade to put a stop to.
O. Mr. Weir, *June 2*, 711.
Rates and Transit Facilities.
Agricultural produce.
Correspondence between Board of Agriculture and Railway Companies, results of.
Os. Earl of Lichfield, *June 9*, 1185-1187 ; Lord Burghclere, 1195.
Local Conferences in cases of dispute between Agriculturists and the Companies.
O. Earl of Onslow, *June 9*, 1199.
Loss or damage during transit—Payment of compensation by the Companies, 1190, 1191.
Preferential rates to Foreign Goods—Committee of Inquiry—Constitution and terms of reference of.
Os. Earl of Lichfield, *June 9*, 1185, 1187-1189 ; Lord Burghclere, 1195 ; Earl of Onslow, 1198, 1199.
Small parcels of, Reduction in Rates for—Action of the Companies.
O. Lord Burghclere, *June 9*, 1196, 1197.
Fish, for—Extending Scope of Inquiry of Committee on Rates for Agricultural Produce.
Q. Mr. Crombie ; *A.* Mr. A. Fellowes, *May 17*, 41.
General Merchandise, on—Appointing Departmental Committee.
Q. Mr. Crombie ; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *May 17*, 39.
Milk.
Conditions of Carriage of, Modification of, proposed.
O. Earl of Lichfield, *June 9*, 1192, 1193.

Railways—*cont.*
Rates and Transit Facilities—*cont.*
Milk—*cont.*
Insanitary Conditions of Vans, etc.
Os. Earl of Lichfield, *June 9*, 1185, 1193, 1194; Lord Burghclere, 1196; Earl of Onslow, 1199, 1200.
Reduction of Rates for large Consignments, Action of the Companies.
Os. Earl of Lichfield, *June 9*, 1190.
Transvaal Commissioner, Name, Salary, Previous Experience, etc., of.
Q. Mr. J. Ellis; *A:* Mr. Lyttelton, *June 6*, 790–791.

Rankin, Sir J. [Herefordshire, Leominster]
Education — Expenses of Elementary Schools — Making one Payment to Correspondent for Distribution without involving Responsibility to Auditor, etc., *June 10*, 1369.

Rasch, Major Sir F. C. [Essex, Chelmsford]
Army.
Expenditure on, proposed Reduction in, *May 17*, 131, 132.
Indian — General Officers — Filling Vacancies, *May 17*, 36.
Irish Guards — Admission to Public Athletic Sports, Lea Bridge, Refused to non-commissioned Officers in Uniform, *June 6*, 787.
Finance Bill, 2R. *May 17*, 131.
Motor Cars, Speed Regulations for — Imprisonment after third offence where injury has been caused, proposed, *June 2*, 638.
Navy—Pensions.
Greenwich Hospital Age Pensions, Shortage in—Assimilating Naval to Army system, *May 17*, 35–36.
Special, Cases of non-award to Applicants over sixty-five of Good Character, etc.—Case of Mr. Fife, *June 6*, 787.

Rates
Particulars of, Liability of Rating Officers to furnish.
Os. Mr. A. Davies, *June 2*, 674; Mr. Long, 678.
Q. Mr. Alfred Davies; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *May 19*, 361.

Redmond, Mr. J. E. [Waterford]
Banking Arrangements for Land Purchase Act 1903, Dissatisfaction of Joint Stock Banks with, *June 7*, 931.
Business of the House, Course of, *June 13*, 1504.
Labourers (Ireland) Bill—Date of Second Reading, *June 8*, 1077, 1078.

Redmond, Mr. J. E.—*cont.*
Land (Ireland) Bill—Date of Second Reading, *June 8*, 1077, 1078.
Salisbury, Marquess of — Erection of Monument to, proposed, *May 17*, 53, 56.

Redmond, Mr. W. H. K. [Clare, E.]
Ballyrankin Estate, Wexford — Sale of Interest of Three Tenants to adjoining Tenant—Sanction of Commissioners, *May 31*, 429–430.
Clare Agricultural Committee — Reason for Non-appointment of Miss Freeman as Instructress in Butter-making, etc., *May 19*, 351.

Reformatory and Industrial Schools
Boys in, Number of—Proportion benefiting by Treatment—Date of Tabling Report for 1903.
Q. Mr. Galloway; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *June 8*, 1067.

Registration of Clubs (Ireland) Bill
c, Rep.* *June 9*, 1234.

Reid, Sir R. T. [Dumfries Burghs]
Licensing Bill, *Com. June 6*, 825; *June 7*, 939; *June 8*, 1175.

Remnant, Mr. J. F. [Finsbury, Holborn]
London County Council (Tramways and Improvements) Bill, *Con. June 9*, 1302.

Renshaw, Sir C. B. [Renfrew, W.]
Education (Scotland) Bill, *Com. June 13*, 1524, 1588.
Education, Scotland — Fund — Balance, Approximate, per head of Average Attendance of Scholars, *May 18*, 168–169.

Representative Peer for Ireland
De Vesci, Viscount—Right of, to Vote at Elections established, *June 13*, 1417.

Reserve Forces Bill
l. 1R.* *June 10*, 1327.

Retaliation
see Fiscal Policy.

Revenue and Expenditure
Amount and Allocation of, since 1893, References to, in Debate on the Finance Bill, *May 17*, 80, 81, 133, 134.
Bills, Money Clauses in — Estimate of probable Expenditure, proposed.
Qs. Mr. E. Robertson; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 13*, 1503.
Committee of Inquiry on—Recommendations of, ignored by the Government.
Os. Mr. Goddard, *May 17*, 129.
Comparison of Expenditure of Continental Countries and the United States, with that of Great Britain.
Os. Mr. Cust, *May 17*, 125; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 140.

[*cont.*

Revenue and Expenditure—*cont.*

Financial Position of the Country, References to, in Debate on the Finance Bill, *May 17*, 62, 69, 71, 89, 117, 127, 135, 141; *May 18*, 198.

Income, Total, of the People of the Country, References to, in Debate on the Finance Bill, *May 17*, 82 83, 118, 127.

Increase in Expenditure.

References to, in Debate on the Finance Bill, *May 17*, 58, 71, 78, 80, 81, 83, 88–91, 100, 101, 114, 117, 122–124, 132, 139.

Expansion and Aggressiveness, Policy of, Responsible for, References to, in Debate on the Finance Bill, *May 17*, 118, 119, 123.

Ratio of, Greater than that of the Growth of Wealth.
Os. Sir W. Harcourt, *May 17*, 64, 68, 70; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 142.

Responsibility of the Government, References to, in Debate on the Finance Bill, *May 17*, 85, 102, 117, 118, 121, 128, 135.

Ireland, Amount Contributed by, References to, in Debate on the Finance Bill, *May 18*, 188, 189, 195–197, 230, 233–236, 240, 241.

Local Taxation Account, Objections to, References to, in Debate on the Finance Bill, *May 17*, 79, 80, 92.

Nett Public Income and Expenditure from 1889–1904.

Return, Ordered, *May 18*, 160.

Post Office, Increase in Revenue and Expenditure of, since 1882.
O. Sir H. Fowler, *May 17*, 79.

Proposals Involving Increased Expenditure Constantly Urged by Private Members, References to, in Debate on the Finance Bill, *May 17*, 77, 134, 140, 141.

Statement of Revenue for past year, and Estimated Revenue for the coming year, Inaccuracy of, References to, in Debate on the Finance Bill, *May 17*, 79, 80, 92.

Treasury Control over Spending Departments.
Os. Mr. Robson, *May 17*, 103; Mr. J. Ellis, 119; Mr. Goddard, 130, 131.

Rhodesia

Chinese Labour, Importation of, Consulting Wishes of Rhodesians on—Allowing Opportunity for Discussion.
Q. Mr. Trevelyan; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 8*, 1078–1079.

Mines—Native Mortality in Selukwe Gold Mines—Date of Tabling Report
Qs. Mr. H. Samuel, Mr. Trevelyan; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *June 6*, 791.

Rhodesia—*cont.*

Southern — Chinese Indentured Labour, Proposed Introduction of.
Correspondence Presented, *May 31*, 425; *June 7*, 909.

Resolution favouring, Terms of, Voting for and against—Allowing Opportunity for Discussion, etc.
Qs. Mr. H. Samuel, Mr. Trevelyan, Mr. Markham, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman; *As.* Mr. Lyttelton, Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 6*, 792–793.

Richard Jaeger's Patent Bill

l. Rep.* *May 17*, 1.
3R.* *June 7*, 906.
c. 1R.* *June 9*, 1202.

Richards, Mr. H. C. [Finsbury, E.]

Education (Scotland) Bill, *Com.*, *June 13*, 1522.

Mail Service — Steamship Subsidies — Renewal of P. and O. Contract, *May 31*, 428.

Richmond Park

Oak Trees, aged, removing dead Limbs and Branches from.
Q. Mr. J. Hutton; *A.* Lord Balcarres, *June 6*, 781–782.

Rickett, Mr. J. C. [Scarborough]

London County Council (Tramways and Improvements) Bill, *Con.*, *June 9*, 1303.

Rigg, Mr. R. [Westmoreland, Appleby]

Telephone Service—Private Wires, Post Office refusal as to, *May 18*, 165.

Ringworm

Poor Law Children suffering from — Statistics as to.
Q. Sir W. Foster; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *June 13*, 1471, 1472.

Ripon, Marquess of

Crown Agents—Remuneration and method of transacting business—Inquiry proposed, *June 10*, 1357–61.

Roads

Traction Engines, damage done by — Necessity for regulations as to speed, etc.
Os. Sir E. Strachey, *June 2*, 634; Mr. Long, 637; Mr. H. Hobhouse, 638.

Roberts, Earl

Pay, Continuation of, Reason for.
Qs. Mr. Markham, Mr. S. Ormsby-Gore; *As.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *June 9*, 1214.

Yeomanry, Equipment, Training and Organisation of, *June 13*, 1440.

Roberts, Mr. J. B. [Carnarvonshire, Eifion]

Law Courts, Perjury in, Taking Steps to Suppress, *May 19*, 359.

Roberts Mr. J. H. [Denbighshire, W.]
- Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *June 6*, 815, 827, 876.
- Tibet Expedition—Re-inforcing Troops—Approximate Cost up to May 1st, 1904, etc., *May 31*, 434–435.
- Transvaal, British Indian Subjects in, Trading rights of, *June 13*, 1487.

Robertson, Mr. E. [Dundee]
- Aliens Bill.
  - Expenses, Resolution as to, *June 8*, 1138.
  - Motion to Commit to Standing Committee on Law, *June 8*, 1101.
- Division challenged frivolously—Members requested to rise in their places—Position of Members already in the lobbies, *June 2*, 706.
- Education (Scotland) Bill, *Com.*, *June 13*, 1509, 1510, 1542.
- Navy—Submarine A1., Loss of—Inquiry, Date of Tabling Report of, *June 8*, 1056 ; *June 13*, 1479.
- Revenue and Expenditure—Money Clauses in Bills—Estimate of probable expenditure, proposed, *June 13*, 1503.

Robertson, Mr. T. H. [Hackney, S.]
- Shop Hours Bill, 2R., *June 1*, 584.

Robson, Mr. W. S. [South Shields]
- Anglo-French Convention Bill, 2R., *June 1*, 548–556.
- Expenditure, increase in, and growth of taxation, *May 17*, 104–107.
- Finance Bill, 2R. *May* 17, 102.
- Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *June 6*, 885.
- Parliamentary Procedure — New Rules, Criticism on Estimates, etc., hampered by, *May 17*, 102, 104.
- Telegraph Service—North Shields Office, Female Learner in, providing Appointment for, *May 18*, 164.

Roche, Mr. J. [Galway, E.]
- Longworth Estate, Galway, Purchase of, by Congested Districts Board—Enlarging adjoining Holdings, *May 17*, 31–32.

Rocket and Line Apparatus
- Navy, supplying in, and making compulsory in Merchant Service.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Massey-Mainwaring ; *As.* Mr. Pretyman, Mr. G. Balfour, *May 18*, 169–170.

Rollit, Sir A. K. [Islington, South.]
- Anglo-French Convention Bill, 2R., *June 1*, 561–565.
- Light Dues, Reduction in, *May 19*, 360.
- Marine Insurance Bill—Date of Re-introduction—Introducing in the Lower House, *May 19*, 368 ; *June 13*, 1468.

Roscommon
- County Councillor, Imprisonment of, for Cruelty to Animals.
  - *Q.* Mr. Hayden ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 13*, 1494, 1495.

Ross-shire
- Hospital Accommodation, Need of, Decision of Local Government Board with regard to.
  - *Q.* Mr. Weir ; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *June* 7, 928–929.
- Schools—Water Supply laid on to Premises, Number of Schools having.
  - *Q.* Mr. Weir ; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *June* 7, 929.

Rugby
- Rifle Range—Allowing Town Volunteers same Privilege as School Corps—Providing additional Range.
  - *Q.* Mr. Corrie Grant ; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *May 19*, 353.

Runciman, Mr. W. [Dewsbury]
- Aliens Bill.
  - Expenses, Resolution as to, *June 8*, 1142.
  - Motion to commit to Standing Committee on Law, *June 8*, 1102.
- Armies, Foreign — Expenditure, Norma Annual, of France, Germany, an Russia in twenty-five years, *May 18*, 161–162.
- Food Supply in time of War—Commissio of Inquiry—Terms of reference, *June 13*, 1501, 1502.
- France, Arbitration Treaty with, Benefi derived by Newfoundland—Cost o carrying out Convention, *June 3*, 720
- Militia—Dining Tents, Government Refusal to supply, *May 18*, 172–173.
- Navies, Foreign — Expenditure, Norma Annual, of France, Germany, an Russia for each of past twenty-fiv years, *May 18*, 169 ; *June 1*, 497 *June 8*, 1045–1046.
- Penal Servitude Bill, 2R., *June 3*, 752.

Russell, Mr. T. W. [Tyrone, S]
- Finance Bill, 2R., *May 18*, 211.
- Fitzwilliam Estate, Sale of—Forcing Ter ants to accept Landlord's Terms, etc *June 2*, 625.
- Ibibio Country, Military Patrol throug *June 2*, 619–620.
- Irish Society, Sale of Villa Residences c in Londonderry, Application of Lan Act 1903 to, *June 7*, 931.
- Land Act, Working of—Obstruction Trinity College and the Landlord *May 19*, 399, 400.
- Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *June 8*, 1177.
- Lough Erne Drainage Charges, Inclusi of, in inquiry as to Trinity Colle rents, proposed, *June 13*, 1492.

[*cont.*

Russell, Mr. T. W.—*cont*
Poor Law Children.
Educational progress of — Granting facilities for testing, to the Board of Education, *June 2*, 659.
Schools, Overcrowding in, *June 2*, 658.
Taxation of Ireland — Protests against over-taxation, etc., *May 18*, 211–216.

Russia
Army Expenditure, Normal annual, in the past twenty-five years.
Q. Mr. Runciman ; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *May 18*, 161–162
German Agreement as to Customs Duties, Giving information as to.
Q. Major Evans Gordon ; *A.* Earl Percy, *June 8*, 1062–1063.
Navy Expenditure, Normal annual, in each of past twenty-five years, Obtaining Information as to.
Q. Mr. Runciman ; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *May 18*, 169 ; *June 8*, 1045–1046.
Q. Mr. Runciman ; *A.* Mr Chamberlain, *June 1*, 497.
Persia, Negotiations with Great Britain as to.
Q. Mr. G. Bowles ; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 13*, 1502.
Trade Report presented, *June 7*, 908.
War with Japan, *see* Russo-Japanese War.

Russo-Japanese War
Contraband of War, Russian Declaration as to—Making Representations to Russian Government.
Q. Mr. Lawson Walton ; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 6*, 804.
Cotton, Declaration of, as contraband of war by the Russian Government—Information as to.
O. Marquess of Lansdowne, *May 19*, 309.
Q. Lord Avebury ; *A.* Marquess of Lansdowne, *May 17*, 11, 12.
Naval Mines outside Territorial Limits, Representations to Russian Government as to, etc.
Q. Mr. J. Campbell ; *A.* Earl Percy, *June 2*, 623.

Rutherford, Mr. W. W. [Liverpool, West Derby.]
Customs Department Preventive Officers, Pay of, *May 31*, 456.

Ryde Gas Bill
c. Lords, Amendments of, *Con.** *May 17*, 23.

St. Bartholomew's Hospital Bill
c. 2R.* *May 17*, 23.
Rep.* *June* 10, 1365.

St. John and St. Saviour, Fitzroy Square
Union of Benefices—Scheme presented, *May 17*, 4, 29.

St. Leonards-on-Sea
Post Office, Sorting of Parcels at—Petition to Hastings Postmaster, enquiring into.
Q. Mr. Freeman-Thomas ; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 17*, 34–35.

St. Marylebone Electric Lighting Bill
l. 3R.* *May 19*, 306.
c. Lords' Amendments, *Con.** *June 10*, 1365.

St. Mary Woolnoth Bill
c. 1R.* *May 17*, 27.
2R.* *June 7*, 914.

Salisbury, late Marquess of
Monument to, Erection of, in St. Peter's Collegiate Church, Westminster.
Address to the King, *May 17*, 5, 49 ; *May 18*, 186.
Os. Marquess of Lansdowne, *May 17*, 5 ; Earl Spencer, 8 ; Mr. A. J. Balfour, *May 17*, 49 ; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, 52 ; Mr. J. Redmond, 53, 56 ; Sir A. Thomas, 55 ; Col. Saunderson, 56.
Arrangements concerning.
Q. Dr. Farquharson ; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *May 18*, 184 ; *May 31*, 435–436.
Message from the King, *June 3*, 713 ; *June 7*, 905.

Samuel, Mr. H. L. [Yorkshire, Cleveland]
Africa, East—Administration of British Territory and of Uganda, Date of Transferring from Foreign to Colonial Office, *June 7*, 926, 927.
Business of the House, Congested State of, *May 19*, 388.
Compulsory Service, Recommendations of Norfolk Commission of Inquiry, Government Attitude towards, *June 2*, 620–621.
Congo Free State, Administration of, by the Belgian Government, Treatment of Natives, etc., *June 9*, 1261–1267.
Income Tax—Consol Certificates—Claims for Refundment of Past Years' Tax, etc., *June 7*, 921.
Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *June 6*, 817.
Macedonia — Gendarmerie, Re-organisation of—Tabling Proposals of General Giorgis, *June 7*, 925.
Poor Law Children, Emigration of, to the Colonies, *June 2*, 640, 641.
Canada, Number sent to, in 1903, *June 13*, 1473.
Rhodesia.
Mines—Native Mortality in Selukwe Gold Mines, *June 6*, 791.
Southern—Proposed Introduction of Chinese Labour, Resolution favouring, *June 6*, 792.

[*cont.*

Samuel, Mr. H. L.—*cont.*
Transvaal
Chinese Labour.
Article 3 of the Convention, Opportunity for Discussion of, *May 19*, 386, 387.
Compounds, Expenses of, to be defrayed by Transvaal Government, *May 19*, 388.
Overseers, Nationality of, *June 8*, 1060.
Wages of Labourers — Kaffirs' Wages, *May 18*, 175.
White Labour, Increase in — Alleged Breach of Faith by the Government—Possibility of discussing, *June 9*, 1082.
Wives and Children of Labourers —Number accompanying or following the first thousand Emigrants, *June 7*, 923.
Native Labour in Mines—Inspectors, Motive of Appointment of — Knowledge of Native Languages, etc., *May 18*, 174.

Samuel, Sir H. S. [Tower Hamlets, Limehouse]
Workhouses, Sick Nursing in — Local Government Board Order, *June 13*, 1472.

Samuel, Mr. S. M. [Tower Hamlets, Whitechapel]
Aliens Bill—Motion to commit to Standing Committee on Law, *June 8*, 1107.

Sandhurst Military College
Entrance Examination, Syllabus of.
Q. Sir H. Vincent; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *May 19*, 352-353.

Sandys, Col. T. M. [Lancashire, Bootle]
Penal Servitude Bill, 2R. *June 3*, 748.

Sassoon, Sir E. A. [Hythe]
Expenditure, Increase in, and Growth of Taxation, *May 17*, 114-116.
Consumption, Sanatoria for, Growth of—Danger, of, etc., *May 19*, 386.
Finance Bill, 2R., *May 17*, 113.

Saunderson, Col. Rt. Hon. E. J. [Armagh, N.]
Finance Bill. 2R., *May 18*, 242.
Financial Relations between England and Ireland, *May 18*, 245.
Salisbury, Marquess of — Erection of Monument to, proposed, *May 17*, 56.

Savings Banks
Accounts (1903) Presented, *June 13*, 1418, 1466.
Post Office—Postage—Reason for increased Estimate.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 19*, 359-360.

Scarisbrick Estate (Amendment) Bill
l. 2R.* *June 9*, 1182.

Scawby
Railway, Light, to Lincoln, Promotion of —Recommending Exchequer Contribution.
Q. Mr. S. Ormsby-Gore; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *June 8*, 1071-1072.

Schwann, Mr. C. E. [Manchester, N.]
India—North-West Frontier—New Province, Administration of—Cost, etc., *June 9*, 1221.
Indian Councils Bill, 2R., *June 1*, 609.
Tibet, Russian Assurances as to Interference in, Government Acceptation of, *June 8*, 1053.
Tilak, Mr., Case of, Information as to Procedure in, *June 9*, 1221.

Scotland
Secretary—Mr. A. Graham Murray.
Lord Advocate—Mr. C. Scott-Dickson.
Lord Justice-General—Lord Kinross.
Vice-President of the Council of Education—Mr. A. Graham Murray.
Cummertrees, New School Building in place of Addition to old one at—Sanctioning Expenditure.
Q. Mr. Maxwell; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *June 8*, 1075-1076.
Deer Forests in, Inaccuracy of Returns as to.
O. Mr. Weir, *May 31*, 482.
Durness, Sutherland, Reason for Omission of, from Parochial Medical Officers Return, 1903.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *June 8*, 1046-1047.
Edinburgh, *see that title.*
Education, *see* Education—Scotland.
Erbusaig Schools, arranging for New Water Supply for.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *June 7*, 919-920.
Fisheries, *see that title.*
Glasgow, *see that title.*
Highlands and Islands, *see that title.*
Income Tax—Method of Collection.
O. Mr. Ainsworth, *May 31*, 486.
Leith, Educational Area for—providing Uniform Bursary System over Edinburgh and.
Q. Mr. M. Ferguson; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *June 6*, 782-783.
Lewis, Island of, *see that title.*
Mallaig, Breakwater at—Date of Completion.
O. Mr. Weir, *June 2*, 710.
Perth Quarter Sessions—Justices, etc., Number of, to be Summoned.
Q. Mr. Buchanan; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *June 9*, 1209.

[*cont.*

Scotland—*cont.*
Poor Law Medical Relief, Report of Departmental Committee on, Steps to carry out Recommendations in.
Q. Mr. M. Ferguson; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *June 6*, 783.
Qs. Mr. Tennant, Mr. C. Wason; *A.* Mr. S. Dickson, *June 6*, 800–801.
Q. Mr. Haldane; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *June 7*, 920.
Ross-shire, *see that title.*

Scott-Montagu, Mr. G. [Hampshire, New Forest]
Motor Cars Act, 1903—Protection afforded by Traders' Licenses—Case of Mr. Macleod, *May 19*, 347.

Sea Fisheries Bill
c. 1R.* *May 18*, 185.

Seamen
See under Merchant Shipping.

Seamen's and Soldiers' False Characters Bill
l. 1R.* *May 17*, 5.
2R. *June 7*, 912.
*Com.** and Rep.* *June 9*, 1185.

Secretary of State for the Colonies
Mr. Alfred Lyttelton.

Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs
Marquess of Lansdowne.

Secretary of State for India
Mr. W. St. John Brodrick.

Secretary for Scotland
Mr. A. Graham Murray.

Secretary of State for War
Mr. H. O. Arnold-Forster.

Seeds
Adulteration of, Cases of — Suggested Amendment of Law.
Q. Mr. Spear; *A.* Mr. A. Fellowes, *May 18*, 180–181.

Seely, Maj. J. E. B. [Isle of Wight]
Musical Copyright Bill, *Con.*, *June 10*, 1408.
Parliamentary Procedure—New Rules—Blocking Motions—Taking steps to prevent, *June 9*, 1232.
Transvaal.
Chinese Labour, importation of.
Expenses of, to be defrayed by the Transvaal Government, *May 19*, 392.
Wages of Labourers—Reducing Minimum Wage, *May 18*, 176.
Financial Condition of, arresting Importation of Chinese Labour in view of Success of, *June 8*, 1062.

Senegambia
Extension of Colony of, to include Yarbutenda under Arbitration Treaty with France.
O. Earl Percy, *June 1*, 501.

Shackleton, Mr. D. J. [Lancashire, Clitheroe]
Enfield Small Arms Factory—Buildings and Plant, Additions to, since 1890—Statistics as to Rifles, Workmen and Wages, *June 8*, 1054–1055.
Factory Act 1901, Section 61, rendering Enforcement of, more easy, *May 19*, 346.
Liverpool Post Office.
Male Telegraph Learners, qualified, providing Appointments for, *June 6*, 779–780.
Refreshment Intervals in, *June 6*, 779.
Naturalisation Certificates—Proposed Reduction of Fees, *May 17*, 33.
Shop Hours Bill—Date of presentation to the House, *May 19*, 408; 2R., *June 1*, 604.
Workmen's Compensation, Amendment of Law as to—Date of Introducing Legislation, *May 19*, 408, 409.

Shaw, Mr. T. [Hawick Burghs]
Education [Scotland] Bill, *Com.*, *June 13*, 1505, 1521, 1534, 1537, 1546, 1579, 1587.
Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *June 7*, 1002.

Sheehy, Mr. D. [Meath, S.]
Education—Attendance, New Rules as to, *June 13*, 1496.

Sheppy Gas Bill
l. Rep.* *May 17*, 1.
3R.* *June 7*, 906.

Shettleston
Electric Lighting Order — Report Presented, *June 9*, 1205; *June 10*, 1327.

Shipowners' Negligence (Remedies) Bill
c. 1R.* *June 6*, 808.

Shop Hours Bill
Date of Presenting to the House.
Qs. Mr. Shackleton, Mr. Speaker, *May 19*, 408; Mr. A. Douglas, 417.
c. 2R. *June 1*, 577.
Debate on Second Reading [Commons] *June 1*, 578.
Appeal to Home Secretary, Provisions as to, 596.
Assistants, Failure to Regulate Hours of Employment of, 578–580, 584, 586, 592, 597, 599, 600, 604.
Compulsory Closing of all Shops of the same class, 584, 585, 604.

[*cont.*

Shop Hours Bill—*cont.*

Debate on Second Reading—cont.

Exemption of Shopkeepers assisted only by Members of their own Family, Proposed, 582, 584, 585, 589.

Injury to Health caused by long hours in Shops, 591-594.

Interference with the Liberty of the Subject, 579, 581, 592.

Local Authorities, Powers to be given to, 581, 583, 585, 589, 595-599.

Local Option, Proposals as to, 578, 581, 583, 590, 601.

London Local Authority—Substituting Metropolitan Borough Councils for L.C.C., proposed, 580, 585, 590, 593, 602, 603.

Referring Bill to Standing Committee on Trade, proposed, 596, 607, 608.

Shopkeepers' Desire for Legislation, 589, 590, 594.

Sunday Opening of Shops, Attitude of the Government towards, 598, 599, 602.

Weekly Half-holiday, advantages of, 588.

Committee Stage, Postponing, to obtain Opinion of Small Shopkeepers, suggested.
Q. Mr. Galloway; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *June 8*, 1066.

Shops

Inspectors Appointed under Acts, Number of, etc.
Return Ordered, *June 13*, 1467.

Siam

Arbitration Treaty between France and Great Britain, *see under* France.

Sierra Leone

Money Orders—Regulations Presented, *May 31*, 425.

Revenue and Expenditure, and Trade from 1895—Statement Presented, *June 6*, 775; *June 7*, 910.

Sinclair, Mr. L. [Essex, Romford]

Congo Free State, Administration of, by the Belgian Government, Treatment of Natives, etc., *June 9*, 1318.

Customs Inspection of Luggage—Establishment of Offices in London and Paris, proposed, *May 31*, 465.

Ministries of Commerce in Foreign Countries, Insufficiency of Reports as to, *June 9*, 1318.

Somaliland Campaign Transport Arrangements, *June 9*, 1318.

Site for Duke of York's School Bill

c. 2R. *June 13*, 1591.

Skipton Water and Improvement Bill

c. Report from Police and Sanitary Committee, *May 17*, 25.
3R.* *June 9*, 1201.
l. 1R.* *June 10*, 1326.

Slack, Mr. B. [Hertfordshire, St. Albans]

Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *June 7*, 1021.

Penal Servitude Bill, 2R. *June 3*, 768.

Whitstable Charities, Draft Scheme for—Proposed diverting of Teachers' Salaries for building National School, *June 2*, 619.

Sloan, Mr. T. H. [Belfast, S.].

Agricultural Department, Veterinary Branch—Petition from Roman Catholic Clerks, alleged Refusal of Chief Clerk to forward, *May 18*, 183.

Army.

Crimean War Pensions—Increase of amount, proposed, *June 9*, 1215.

Infantry Sergeants, New Service Cap for, proposed, *May 18*, 171.

Ballinasloe Lunatic Asylum—Appointment of Dr. Kirwan—Sanction of Lord-Lieutenant, *May 19*, 366, 367.

Belfast Post Office Messengers, Sunday pay of, *June 9*, 1226.

Constabulary, R.I.—Dismissal of Constable Anderson, *June 13*, 1500.

Dublin—Soldiers, Prohibition of, from walking in main streets, alleged, *June 13*, 1482.

Dungannon Disturbances—Action of Constabulary, *May 18*, 182.

Smith, Sir J. P. [Lanarkshire, Partick]

Education [Scotland] Bill, *Com.*, *June 13*, 1533, 1536, 1538, 1552, 1573.

Smith, Mr. S. [Flintshire]

Tibet Expedition—Protectorate, Question as to establishment of, *May 19*, 386.

Smith, Mr. W. F. D. [Strand, Westminster]

Goktiek Railway Bridge, Condition of, Name of Constructor, etc., *June 13*, 1475.

Smugglers

Capture of, Amount of Estimate for, etc.
Os. Mr. Whitley, *May 31*, 467, 470; Mr. V. Cavendish, 470, 471; Mr. Caldwell, 470; Mr. Weir, Mr. G. Bowles, Lord E. Fitzmaurice, 471; Mr. Dalziel, 472.

Soares, Mr. E. [Devonshire, Barnstaple]

Devonshire.

Geological Survey of—New Survey proposed, *June 13*, 1491.

Harbour of Refuge on Coast of, Names of Local Authorities making Representations as to, *June 8*, 1070-1071.

Musical Copyright Bill, *Con.*, *June 10*, 1396.

Soldiers
See under Army.

Solicitor-General
Sir E. Carson.

Solicitor-General for Ireland
Mr. J. H. M. Campbell.

Somaliland
Campaign in.
Expenditure on, References to, in Debate on the Finance Bill, *May 17*, 137, 145.
Cost, Total, prior to 1st October, 1902.
Q. Mr. Lambert; *A.* Earl Percy, *June 8*, 1048.
Transport arrangements.
O. Mr. L. Sinclair, *June 9*, 1318.

Soudan
British Subjects in—Total Number—Proportion of Maltese.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 31*, 431-432.

South African War
Transports, Date of Tabling Return as to.
Q. Mr. Buchanan; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *June 8*, 1049.
Transvaal Contribution, Arrangements as to payment of.
Q. Mr. Whitley; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *June 13*, 1491.

South Staffordshire Mines Drainage Bill
c. Rep.* *June 10*, 1365.

Spain
Trade Report, Presented, *May 19*, 308.

Spear, Mr. J. W. [Devon. Tavistock]
Seeds, Adulteration of—Cases—Suggested Amendment of Law, *May 18*, 180.

Spencer, Rt. Hon. C. R. [Northants, Mid]
Compulsory Service—Recommendations of Norfolk Commission of Inquiry, Results of, *June 2*, 621.
Division Challenged frivolously—Members requested to Rise in their Places—Position of Members in the Lobbies, *June 2*, 705.

Speaker
Adjournment for Whitsuntide—Subjects for Discussion on the Motion, *May 19*, 386, 387, 399, 409.
Bill passed through Grand Committee, Possibility of Amending on Report Stage, *June 8*, 1122.
Discussion of Clause not before the House, *June 2*, 689.
Divisions.
Members requested to Rise in their Places, Definition of, *June 3*, 721.
Omission of Member's Name, *June 3*, 721; *June 6*, 806.

Speaker—*cont.*
Education — Article 31 of New Code—Opportunity for Discussion, *June 6*, 807.
Education Board Provisional Orders (Cardiff and Newport, Monmouthshire) Bill.
Motion for Rejection of, and Instruction to Committee, Objects of, *June 13*, 1558.
Education [Scotland] Bill, Extension of, to England and Wales—Instructions as to, out of Order, *June 13*, 1505.
Fiscal Policy.
Amendment to Motion handed in by the Prime Minister after the Speaker had left the Chair—Action of the Clerk of the House, *May, 18*, 185.
Reply to Personal Challenge during Speech of another Member, Ruling as to, *May 18*, 266.
Interruptions to Debate, *May 18*, 272.
Irrelevant Matter, Introduction of, *June 3*, 766; *June 8*, 1087, 1089.
Irrelevant Observations, *May 17*, 46; *June 6*, 789; *June 9*, 1229.
Licensing Bill — Instructions to Committee, Rulings as to, *June 6*, 808, 809.
Musical Copyright Bill.
Consolidation of Acts of 1902 and 1904—*Bona-fide* Intentions of Promoters, *June 10*, 1373.
Irrelevant Matter, Introduction of, *June 10*, 1374, 1375, 1389, 1397, 1404, 1415.
Second Reading of a Clause having been accepted, Allowability of moving Amendment to it, *June 10*, 1385.
Personal Allusions and Insinuations during Debate, *June 2*, 690.
Questions.
Notice of, *June 6*, 802.
Supplementary, after that on the Paper has been fully answered, *June 13*, 1485, 1500, 1501.
Shop Hours Bill—Date of presenting to the House, *May 19*, 408.
Tibet Expedition, Discussion of, precluded by Motion on the Paper, *May 19*, 386.
Transvaal — Chinese Labour Question — White Labour, Employment of — Alleged breach of faith by the Government—Possibility of discussing, *June 10*, 1082, 1083.

Spencer, Earl
Coasting Trade—Practice of other Maritime Countries in reserving to Vessels of their own Nationality, *June 13*, 1459

[*cont.*

Spencer, Earl—*cont.*
- Salisbury, Lord—Erection of Monument to, proposed, *May 17*, 8.
- Tibet Expedition, Progress of—Policy of H.M. Government, etc., *May 17*, 12–15.

Stafford, County of
- Polling Districts, Alteration in—Handsworth Parliamentary Division—Order presented, *June 6*, 776 ; *June 7*, 912.

Staffordshire, 3rd North, Regiment
- Vernon, W., Alleged wrongful arrest of. *Qs.* Mr. Weir ; *As.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *June 2*, 621 ; *June 9*, 1214, 1215.

Stamps
- *See under* Post Office.

Standing Orders
- Select Committee on—Quorum, Alteration of Number for, *June 7*, 914.
- Suspension of Nos. 39, 128 and 230, *May 19*, 338.
- Suspension of Nos. 72 and 82, *June 13*, 1419.

Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord—*Postmaster-General* [Lancashire, Westhoughton]
- Astley Abbotts, Establishment of Post and Telegraph Office at, proposed, *June 9*, 1226.
- Collections, Postal—Weight to be conveyed by one Man with Handcart, *May 17*, 34.
- Gratuities for Officials not entitled to Pensions, *May 31*, 429.
- Guide Postal—Sunday Despatches and Deliveries, Additional information as to, *June 9*, 1207.
- Hastings.
  - Salaries of Officials—Amount of increase, *May 17*, 34.
  - Sorting of Parcels at St. Leonards-on-Sea, Petition to Postmaster as to, *May 17*, 35.
- Ireland.
  - Armagh Telegraph Office, Hours of Duty in, *June 2*, 619.
  - Belfast Messengers, Sunday Pay of, *June 9*, 1227.
  - Cahir, Opening Telephone Exchange at, in connection with Service between Tipperary and Clonmel, *June 6*, 781.
  - Clones Post Office—Arrangements in New Buildings, *June 9*, 1207.
  - Cork — Examinations—Restriction of Candidature to persons in employment of Post Office, *June 13*, 1471.
  - Ennis Postmastership—Date of becoming vacant—Advertising in Post Office Circular, *May 19*, 349.

Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord—*cont.*
- Ireland—*cont.*
  - Female Telegraphists, Vacancies among, since Dec. 12, 1903, *June 3*, 717.
  - Gratuities for Officials not entitled to Pensions — Amount to be distributed in Ireland, *May 31*, 429.
  - Kilcoo, Delay in Delivery of Letters at, *June 2*, 627.
  - Nenagh, Extension of Telephone Service to, proposed, *June 8*, 1050 ; *June 13*, 1471.
  - Omagh Office, Duty of arranging Overtime at, *June 7*, 932.
  - West of Ireland to Belfast, Delay in Transmission of Mails from, *June 3*, 718.
- Letters.
  - Kilcoo, Ireland—Delays in Delivery, Prevention of, *June 2*, 627.
  - Newsletters, Carelessness in Sorting at General Post Office, alleged, *June 8*, 1068.
  - Sunday Deliveries, etc.—Additional Information in Postal Guide, proposed, *June 9*, 1207.
- Liverpool Office.
  - Male Telegraph Learners, qualified, Providing Appointments for, *June 6*, 780.
  - Refreshment Intervals in — *June 6*, 779.
- London.
  - General Post Office—Alleged Carelessness in Sorting Newsletters, *June 8*, 1068.
  - Oxford Street (No. 10) Insanitary Condition of, alleged, *June 9*, 1206.
  - Pillar Boxes in W.C. District—Inaccuracy of time plates, *May 19*, 350.
  - Sorter Tracers, answering Memorial from, as to Pay and Promotion, *June 6*, 781.
- Magazine Rates to and from the Colonies, Proposed Reduction in, estimated loss of Revenue by, *June 8*, 1069-1070.
- Mail Service.
  - Australia, introducing Penny Post to, *June* 8, 1069.
  - Eastern — Committee Recommendations, *May 17*, 35.
  - Steamship Subsidies—Renewal of P. and O. Contract, *May 31*, 428.
- Middlesbrough — Case of Mr. Chandler, *June 13*, 1470.
- Oxford Street (No. 10)—Insanitary Condition, alleged, *June 9*, 1206.
- Pillar Boxes in W.C. District—Inaccuracy of time plates, *May 19*, 350.

[*cont.*

Stanley, Right Hon. Lord—*cont.*
Postage.
Magazine Rates to and from Colonies—Estimated loss of Revenue by proposed Reduction, *June 8*, 1069–1070.
Penny—Australia, Negotiations as to, *June 8*, 1069.
Postal Guide — Sunday Deliveries, etc., Additional information as to, proposed, *June 9*, 1207.
Postmasters—Ennis Postmastership—Date of becoming vacant — Advertising in Post Office Circular, *May 19*, 349.
Provincial Offices, Want of Vacancies for qualified Female Learners in, *June 7*, 928.
St. Leonards-on-Sea Office, Sorting of Parcels at—Petition to Hastings Postmaster, enquiring into, *May 17*, 35.
Savings Bank, Postage—Reason for increased Estimate, *May 19*, 360.
Sorting of Newsletters, Carelessness as to, making Inquiry into, *June 8*, 1068.
Stamps, Books of Halfpenny, suggested Issue of, *June 6*, 798.
Telegraph Service.
Astley Abbotts, Establishment of Office at, proposed, *June 9*, 1226.
Iceland and Faroe Islands, Establishing Communication with, Progress of, *June 8*, 1069.
Ireland.
Armagh Office, Hours of Duty in, *June 2*, 619.
Dublin Office — Public Cross-examination of Officials, Investigating practice of, *May 19*, 349.
Female Telegraphists, Vacancies among, since December 12, 1903, Number of, filled by Competition and Nomination, *June 3*, 717.
Mountrath and Coolrain, Connection between, Cause of Delay in completing, *May 18*, 165.
Linemen, Cycle Allowance of 2d. a Mile to, Continuing Allowance, *June 6*, 797.
Liverpool Office, Qualified Male Learners in, Providing Appointments for, *June 6*, 780.
Middlesbrough — Case of Mr. Chandler, *June 13*, 1470.
North Shields Office, Female Learner in, Providing Appointment for, *May 18*, 164.
Oxford Office—Compelling Staff to perform Postal Duties, *June 6*, 780.

Stanley, Right Hon. Lord—*cont.*
Telephone Service.
Ireland.
Cahir, Opening Exchange at, in connection with Service between Tipperary and Clonnel, *June 6*, 781.
Nenagh, Tipperary, Establishing Exchange at, *June 8*, 1050; *June 13*, 1471.
National Telephone Company, Negotiations with, Progress of, etc., *June 6*, 797; *June 8*, 1068–1069.
Private Wires, Post Office Refusal as to, *May 18*, 165–166.
Wages—Committee of Sir E. Bradford, Date of Tabling Report of, etc., *June 2*, 623, 624.

Stationery Office
Report presented, *May 17*, 4, 29.

Stevenson, Mr. F. S. [Suffolk, Eye]
Armenia, Disturbed Condition of—Steps taken to Prevent Outrages, *May 19*, 409.

Stewart, Sir M. J. McT. [Kirkcudbright]
Education [Scotland] Bill, *Com.*, *June 13*, 1545.
Licensing Bill, *Com*, *June 7*, 989.

Strachey, Sir E. [Somersetshire, S.]
Education—New Code.
Article 31, Opportunity for Discussion of, *June 6*, 807.
Grants, System of—Opportunity for Discussion, *June 6*, 799 800.
Friendly Societies, Unregistered, Position of—Payment of Income Tax, etc., *May 31*, 478.
Motor Cars — Speed Regulations and Notices, *June 2*, 632–634.
Outdoor Relief (Friendly Societies) (No 3) Bill, 2R. *June 3*, 771.
Traction Engines, Damage done to roads by, *June 2*, 634.

Straits Settlements
Chinese Indentured labour, terms of Employment of.
Q. Mr. Trevelyan; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *June 13*, 1487.

Street Betting Bill
l. Rep.* *May 17*, 5; *May 19*, 309.
3R.* *June 7*, 913.
c. 1R.* *June 13*, 1462.

Street Traffic (Regulation) Bill
c. 1R.* *June 9*, 1235.

Stretford Urban District Council Bill
l. Report from Select Committee, *June 10*, 1325.

Strikes and Lock-outs

Report for 1903 Presented, *May 31*, 426 ; *June 7*, 910.

Submarines

See under Navy.

Suez Canal

Arbitration Treaty between Great Britain and France, *see under* France.

Shipping and Tonnage Return presented *May 19*, 308, 342.

Sugar

Brussels Convention.

Interpretation of the Treaty—Date of next Sitting, etc.
O. Mr. G. Bowles, *June 9*, 1293, 1294.

Papers relating to, Inaccuracy of.
Os. Mr. G. Bowles, *June 9*, 1291, 1294 ; Earl Percy, 1319.
Q. Mr. G. Bowles ; *A.* Earl Percy, *June 13*, 1488.

Permanent Commission, Proceedings and Reports of—Tabling, proposed.
Os. Mr. G. Bowles, *June 9*, 1290, 1291 ; Earl Percy, 1319.

Reports and Findings presented, *June 1*, 494 ; *June 7*, 909.

Self-Governing Colonies, imposition of Countervailing duties on Sugar from.
O. Mr. G. Bowles, *June 9*, 1291, 1292 ; Earl Percy, 1320.
Q. Mr. G. Bowles ; *A.* Earl Percy, *June 13*, 1488, 1489.

Sugared products, application of the Convention to.
Os. Mr. G. Bowles, *June 9*, 1292, 1293 ; Earl Percy, 1320.
Q. Mr. G. Bowles ; *A.* Earl Percy, *June 13*, 1488, 1489.

Certificate of origin, and bonding of sugar —Information as to working of Act.
Os. Mr. Lough, *May 31*, 465 ; Mr. V. Cavendish, 466.

Sullivan, Mr. D. [Westmeath, S.]

Longford Estate, Arrangements for sale of [illegible] —Application of A. Caddell for Reinstatement, *June 6*, 801.

Superannuation

Civil Service, *see that title.*

Swat

Administration, Cost of, etc.
Q. Mr. Schwann ; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 9*, 1221.

Swindon Corporation Bill

c. Report from Police and Sanitary Committee, *June 10*, 1365.

Talbot, Lord E. [Sussex, Chichester]

Education Board Provisional Orders (Cardiff and Newport, Monmouthshire) Bill, 2R., *June 13*, 1570.

Talbot, Rt. Hon. J. G. [Oxford University]

Police Courts—Hearing of Juvenile Cases —Separating Juvenile from Adult Offenders, *May 18*, 163.

Tarbet

Coach Service to Listowel — Contract Price—Inviting Local Tenders.
Q. Mr. Flavin ; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, Mr. Speaker, *May 17*, 45-46.
Q. Mr. Flavin ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 19*, 365-366.

Taxation

Average rate per head of the Population.
O. Sir H. Fowler, *May 17*, 82.

Class of people on whom the increased Taxation will fall, References to, in Debate on the Finance Bill, *May 17*, 82, 135, 136.

Growth of, References to, in Debate on the Finance Bill, *May 17*, 63, 64, 78, 80, 81, 133.

Incidence of, Broadening of, proposed, References to, in Debate on the Finance Bill, *May 17*, 57, 58, 127.

Income Tax, *see that title.*

Ireland.

Amount contributed to the Revenue by, References to, in Debate on the Finance Bill, *May 18*, 188, 189, 195-197, 230, 233 236, 240, 241.

Commercial Development of, retarded by over-taxation, References to, in Debate on the Finance Bill, *May 18*, 187, 190, 195.

Emigration, Increase in, Due to over-taxation, References to, in Debate on the Finance Bill, *May 18*, 192, 209, 210, 212, 242.

Expenditure in, as a set-off to Taxation, References to, in Debate on the Finance Bill, *May 18*, 201, 202, 204, 212, 213, 233, 238, 246.

Financial Autonomy subject to fixed Financial contribution, proposed.
Os. Mr. Waldron, *May 18*, 205, 206 ; Mr. Lough, 211 ; Mr. T. W. Russell, 215.

Injustice of Taxing Ireland equally with England, References to, in Debate on the Finance Bill, *May 18*, 198-201, 208, 212, 226, 229, 231, 232, 246.

Inquiry into Taxable capacity of, proposed, References to, in Debate on the Finance Bill, *May 18*, 211, 216, 226.

Total Taxation of, in proportion to the Population, References to, in Debate on the Finance Bill, *May 18*, 190, 191, 204, 209, 230.

[*cont.*

Taxation—*cont.*
Local Taxation, *see that title.*
Proportion as between the Direct and Indirect Taxpayer, References to, in Debate on the Finance Bill, *May 17*, 60, 99, 100, 135.
Sources of Supply.
O. Mr. A. Chamberlain, *May 17*, 99.
Trade, taxes on, Objections to.
Os. Mr. Robson, *May 17*, 105; Mr. Kearley, 111, 112.
War Taxes, necessity for continuing, Reference to in debate on the Finance Bill, *May 17*, 62, 66, 83, 109, 133.

Taylor, Mr. A. [Liverpool, East Toxteth]
Congo Free State, Administration of, by the Belgian Government, Treatment of Natives, etc., *June 9*, 1247–1251.
Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *June 6*, 828, 889.
Lighthouse Fund—Balance in Hand, *May 19*, 360.

Taylor, Mr. T. C. [Lancashire, Radcliffe]
Shop Hours Bill, 2R., *June 1*, 599.
Vagrants—Difficulty of dealing with—Establishment of labour colonies, etc., *June 2*, 659–61.

Tea
Custom House Inspection of—Quantity and quality of tea dealt with—Remuneration and duties of Inspectors.
Os. Mr. Lough, *May 31*, 463, 464; Mr. V. Cavendish, 466.
Duty on.
Ad valorem duty, proposed.
O. Sir E. Sassoon, *May 17*, 116.
Additional 2d. per pound — Budget proposal, References to, in debate on the Finance Bill, *May 17*, 57, 75, 111, 112, 115, 116.
Ireland — Hardships inflicted by the tax on the poor, References to, in the debate on the Finance Bill, *May 18*, 189, 236.
Operations in bond—Regulations as to bulking together parcels.
Q. Mr. Lough; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *June 13*, 1474.
Persia, Duty in—Effect on importation of Indian tea into Persia.
Q. Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Earl Percy, *June 13*, 1487, 1488.

Teachers
See under Education, *and for* National School Teachers, Ireland, *see that title.*

Teenan Estate
Evictions on—Enabling Tenants to purchase Holdings, etc.
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 10*, 1370–1371.

Telegraph Service
Astley Abbotts, Establishment of office at, proposed.
Q. Mr Hunt; *A.* Lord Stanley, *June 9*, 1226.
Iceland and the Faroe Islands, establishing Communication with, Progress of.
Q. Mr. Doughty; *A.* Lord Stanley, *June 8*, 1069.
Ireland
Armagh Office, Hours of Duty in.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Lord Stanley, *June 2*, 619.
Dublin Office—Public Cross-Examination of Officials, Investigating Practice of.
Q. Mr. Nannetti; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 19*, 349.
Female Telegraphists, Vacancies among, since Dec. 12, 1903, Number of, filled by Competition and Nomination.
Q. Mr. MacVeagh; *A.* Lord Stanley, *June 3*, 717.
Mountrath and Coolrain, Connection between, Delay in Completing.
Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 18*, 164–165.
Linemen, Cycle Allowance of 2d. a Mile to—Continuing Allowance.
Q. Capt. Norton; *A.* Lord Stanley, *June 6*, 797.
Liverpool Office—Qualified Male Learners, providing Appointments for.
Q. Mr. Shackleton; *A.* Lord Stanley, *June 6*, 779–780.
Middlesborough—Case of Mr. Chandler—Revision of Duties, proposed.
Q. Mr. Henderson; *A.* Lord Stanley, *June 13*, 1470.
North Shields Office, Female Learner in, Providing Appointment for.
Q. Mr. Robson; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 18*, 164.
Oxford Office—Compelling Staff to perform Postal Duties.
Q. Mr. W. Jones; *A.* Lord Stanley, *June 6*, 780.

Telephone Service
Ireland
Cahir, Opening Exchange at, in connection with Service between Tipperary and Clonmel.
Q. Mr. Cullinan; *A.* Lord Stanley, *June 6*, 781.
Nenagh, Extension to, proposed.
Qs. Mr. P. J. O'Brien; *As.* Lord Stanley, *June 8*, 1050; *June 13*, 1471.
National Telephone Company, Negotiations with, Progress of, etc.
Q. Mr. Lough; *A.* Lord Stanley, *June 6*, 796–797.
Qs. Sir F. Banbury, Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Lord Stanley, *June 8*, 1068–1069.

[*cont.*

Telephone Service—*cont.*
- Private Wires, Post Office Refusal to enter into fresh Contracts for—Reason. etc. *Q.* Mr. Rigg; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 18*, 165-166.

Tennant, Mr. H. J. [Berwickshire]
- Aliens Bill—Motion to commit to Standing Committee on Law, *June 8*, 1106.
- Education [Scotland] Bill, *Com. June 13*, 1540.
- Employment of Children Act—By-Laws, Sanctioning of — Local Authorities prohibiting Street Trading by Girls under Sixteen, *June 6*, 796.
- Nursing, Setting up Select Committee on—State Registration of Nurses, *June 6*, 805.
- Poor Law, Scotland—Medical Relief, Report of Departmental Committee on. *June 6*, 800.

Thames River Steamboat Service Bill
- *c. Con.*, *June 2*, 680.
  - 3r.* *June 6*, 773.
- *l.* 1r.* *June 7*, 907.
- *Debate on Consideration* [Commons], *June 2*, 680.
  - Boroughs and Municipalities in favour of the Bill, 692, 700, 701.
  - Financial Aspect of the Question, 681, 687, 696, 698, 699, 702.
  - Former attempts at Legislation rejected, 681, 687, 688, 691, 697.
  - Hill, Mr. A., Steamboat service of—Treatment by the London County Council, etc., 684-690, 692-697, 700.
  - Monopoly granted to the London County Council, 683, 684.
  - Municipal Trading Scheme, Objections to, 682, 687, 700, 701.
  - Postponement of consideration for six months, proposed, 680, 688.
  - West Ham, Exclusion of, 683, 684, 690, 692, 693, 695.

"Thistle" Launch
- Sinking, Cause of, Salvage operations, etc., *Qs.* Sir J. Leng, Capt. Donelan; *As.* Mr. Pretyman, *June 9*, 1213, 1214.

Thomas, Sir A. [Glamorganshire, E.]
- Salisbury, Marquess of—Erection of Monument to, proposed, *May 17*, 55.

Thomas, Mr. D. A. [Merthyr Tydvil]
- Canada—Woollen Goods, Import Duty on, proposed Rise in, *June 6*, 798.
- Local Government Board, Committee Report on, Date of Tabling, *June 6*, 798.
- Military Commands — Creating separate Command for South Wales and Monmouthshire, *May 17*, 38.
- Trade, Board of, Committee Report on, Date of Tabling, *June 6*, 798.

Thorburn, Sir W. [Peebles and Selkirk]
- Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *June 6*, 841.

Thornton, Mr. P. M. [Clapham]
- Shop Hours Bill, 2r. *June 1*, 582.

Tibet Expedition
- *Debate* [Lords], *May 17*, 12.
  - Attacks on the Force by the Tibetans, 13, 16.
  - Character of the Expedition, 13, 21.
  - China.
    - Amban, Position of, 15, 18, 20-22.
    - Attitude of, 15, 18, 20-22.
  - History of the Expedition, 13, 14.
  - Lhasa, Advance to, 14, 17, 18, 20, 22.
  - Objects of the Expedition and Policy of H.M. Government, 12, 13, 15-17, 19, 22.
  - Progress of the Expedition, 12, 13.
  - Reasons for the Despatch of the Expedition, 19-21.
- Bullets, Explosive, Use of, *Q.* Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 10*, 1369-1370.
- Discussion on, Allowing Opportunity for. *Qs.* Mr. Lambert, Mr. Flynn; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *May 18*, 184.
- Lhasa, Advance to.
  - Chinese Assent to. *Qs.* Mr. Flynn; *As.* Earl Percy, *May 19*, 358-359.
  - Date fixed for—Russian Influence on Negotiations. *Q.* Mr. Lambert; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 6*, 793-794.
- Position — Reinforcing Troops — British Policy—Approximate Cost up to 1st May, 1904, etc. *Qs.* Mr. H. Roberts, Mr. Lough; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *May 31*, 434-435.
- Protectorate in, Question as to Establishment of. *Q.* Mr. S. Smith, *May 19*, 386.
- Russian Assurances as to Interferance, Government Acceptation of. *Q.* Mr. Schwann; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 8*, 1053.

Ticehurst and District Water and Gas Bill
- *c.* 2r.* *June 8*, 1041.

Tilak, Mr., Case of
- Proceedure in, Information as to. *Q.* Mr. Schwann; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *June 9*, 1221.

Tithe Rents, Ireland
- Redemption of—Terms under Ashbourne and Land Acts of 1896 and 1903. *Q.* Mr. Gilhooly; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 18*, 183.

Torbay
Firing of Heavy Guns off, Nuisance caused by, Taking Steps to Minimise.
Q. Sir J. Kennaway; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *June 6*, 777.

Toulmin, Mr. G. [Bury, Lancashire]
Penal Servitude Bill, 2R. *June 3*, 741.
Poor Law Children—Scattered Homes and Boarding-out Systems, Extension of, *June 2*, 661–663.

Traction Engines
Damage done to Roads by—Necessity for Regulations as to Speed, etc.
Os. Sir E. Strachey, *June 2*, 634; Mr. Long, 637; Mr. H. Hobhouse, 638.

Trade, Board of
President—Mr. Gerald W. Balfour.
Parliamentary Secretary—Mr. A. Bonar Law.
Ireland, Establishment of Department in, proposed.
O. Mr. Field, *May 18*, 248.
Labour Department—Strikes and Lock-outs—Report Presented, *May 31*, 426; *June 7*, 910.
Re-organisation—Committee of Inquiry—Report on Duties of Board.
Date of Issuing.
O. Mr. C. Hay, *June 2*, 654, 655.
Q. Mr. D. A. Thomas; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *June 6*, 798.
Report Presented *June 8*, 1045; *June 9*, 1184.

Trade and Commerce
British Interests in Foreign Countries—Failure of the Government to Safeguard and Advance in the Anglo-French Convention.
Os. Mr. Robson, *June 1*, 550-555; Mr. J. Walton, 557-559; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, 566.
Ministries of Commerce in Foreign Countries, Insufficiency of Reports as to.
O. Mr. L. Sinclair, *June 9*, 1318.
Taxation, Increase in, Effect of, on.
Os. Mr. Robson, *May 17*, 105; Mr. Kearley, 111, 112.

Trade Disputes Bill
Third Reading, Date of
Q. Mr. Lundon; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 9*, 1232, 1233.

Trade Reports
Annual Series, presented, *May 17*, 29; *May 18*, 160; *May 19*, 308; *May 31*, 423, 426; *June 1*, 494; *June 6*, 776; *June 7*, 907; *June 10*, 1326, 1368; *June 13*, 1418, 1466.
Miscellaneous Series, presented, *May 18*, 159; *May 19*, 308; *June 1*, 494; *June 7*, 907; *June 10*, 1327, 1368.

Trafford Park Dock and Railway Bill
l. Report from Select Committee, *June 7*, 905.
3R.* *June 13*, 1418.

Tralee
Railway to Dingle, Negotiations as to—Submitting Terms of Agreement to the House.
Qs. Mr. Field, Mr. Nannetti, Mr. Murphy; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 7*, 929–930.

Tramways
Westminster Bridge Terminus, Removal of—Proposed Government action.
Q. Capt. Jessel; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *May 31*, 427.

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill
l. 2R.* *June 10*, 1326.

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill
l. 2R.* *May 19*, 307.

Transvaal
British Indian Subjects, Rights of, to trade.
Q. Mr. H. Roberts; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *June, 13*, 1487.
Boer Court Decisions against, upheld by Local Government—Action of Colonial Office, etc.
Qs. Sir M. Bhownaggree, Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 19*, 357–358.
Chinese Labour, Importation of.
Arrival at Durban of Advance Party, alleged.
Q. Mr. Whitley; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *June 13*, 1486.
Article 3 of the Convention, Discussion of, precluded by Motion on the Paper.
Os. Mr. H. Samuel, *May 19*, 386, 387, Mr. Speaker, Mr. S. Buxton, Mr. Whitley, 387.
Australian Parliament, Resolutions passed by—Divisional Figures—Terms.
Q. Mr. J. Ellis; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 18*, 176–177.
Cape Colony Legislative Assembly—Chinese Exclusion Bill, Reason for refusing Governor's Assent to, etc.
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *June 10*, 1371-1372.
Consul, Chinese, Powers of.
Q. Mr. J. A. Pease; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *June 9*, 1215, 1216.

[*cont.*

Transvaal—*cont.*
Chinese Labour, Importation of—*cont.*
Expenses of, to be defrayed by Transvaal Government.
Os. Mr. Lyttelton, *May 19*, 387, 393, 394, 397; Mr. H. Samuel, 388; Mr. S. Buxton 389; Major Seely, 392; Mr. W. Churchill, 394; Mr. Lloyd-George, 396, 397

Financial Condition of Transvaal, Arresting Importation in view of.
Q. Major Seeley; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *June* 8, 1062.

Hong-Kong, Coolies awaiting shipment at, Isolation of—Numbers.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 19*, 356–357.

Intoxicants, Sale of, to Labourers, Arrangements as to.
Qs. Captain Ellice; *As.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 17*, 37; *June 8*, 1061.

Natives liberated for Agricultural purposes by, estimated Number of.
Q. Mr. S. Ormsby-Gore; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *June* 8, 1060–1061.

Offices, Depôts, etc., Estimated Cost of building—Authority responsible for Cost, etc.
Q. Mr. Whitley; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May* 31, 434.

Ordinance with regulations and terms of Contract, etc.—Date of presenting to Parliament.
Os. Mr. S. Buxton, *May 19*, 390; Mr. Lyttelton, 394.

Presented, *May 18*, 159; *May 19* 308.

Overseers, Asiatics as, Regulations as to.
Qs. Mr. Markham, Mr. H. Samuel Mr. Lough; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *June 8*, 1059–1060.

Regulations, Date of Tabling.
Q. Sir H. Fowler]; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 18*, 174.

Unskilled Work, Provisions for restriction to.
Qs. Mr. S. Ormsby-Gore, Mr. S. Buxton, Sir H. Cambell-Bannerman Mr. C. Wason, Mr. Markham, Mr. J. Walton, Mr. Bayley; *As.* Mr. Lyttelton, *June 9*, 1216–1218.

Unskilled Labour, Provisions for restriction to.
Q. Mr. Hunt; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *June 13*, 1482–1483.

Q. Dr. Macnamara; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *June 13*, 1485.

Transvaal—*cont.*
Chinese Labour, Importation of—*cont.*
Wage, Rate of—Regulations.
Os. Mr. S. Buxton, *May 19*, 395; Mr. Lyttelton, 395, 396.
Q. Mr. Whitley; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 17*, 37.

Minimum Wage—Kaffirs' Wages, etc.
Qs. Mr. H. Samuel, Mr. Markham, Mr. Crooks, Mr. Whitley, Mr. J. O'Connor, Major Seeley; *As.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 18*, 175-176.
Qs. Dr. Macnamara, Sir J. Gorst, Mr. Bryce, Sir H. Fowler; *As.* Mr. Lyttelton, *June 13*, 1483–1485.

White Labour.
Effect on—Class of Work open to Chinese.
Qs. Mr. S. Ormsby-Gore, Mr. S. Buxton, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. C. Wason, Mr. Markham, Mr. J. Walton, Mr. Bayley; *As.* Mr. Lyttelton, *June 9*, 1216–1218.

Increased Employment likely to result—Alleged breach of faith by the Government—Possibility of discussing.
Os. Mr. H. Samuel, *June 9*, 1082; Mr. Speaker, 1082, 1083, Mr. MacKenna, Mr. S. Buxton, 1083

Wives and Children of Labourers—Number accompanying or following the First Thousand Emigrants.
Q. Mr. H. Samuel; Mr. Lyttelton, *June 7*, 923.

Dynamite Duty, Exclusion of British Manufacturers by, alleged.
Qs. Mr. Markham; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *June 9*, 1219.

Financial Conditon of.

Chinese Labour, Arresting importation of, in view of.
Q. Major Seely; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *June 8*, 1062.

Information as to present position.
Q. Mr. S. Buxton; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *June 9*, 1218.

Q. Whitley; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *June 9*, 1220.

Government Stores, Sale of, by Col. Morgan—Proposed Government action.
Q. Mr. C Hobhouse; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *June 8*, 1057.

[*cont.*

Transvaal—*cont.*
Labour Question.
Chinese Labour, *see that sub-heading.*
Native Labour in Mines.
British Central Africa.
Latest Date of Importation from, in 1904—Prohibiting Importation during winter, etc.
Q Sir J. Gorst; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *June 6*, 791–792.
Wages of Labourers.
Q. Sir J. Gorst; *Q.* Mr. Lyttelton, *June 9*, 1212.
Forced Labour for offenders, alleged.
Qs. Mr. Whitley, Mr. Crooks; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 18*, 177, 178.
Qs. Mr. Whitley; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *June 13*, 1486.
Inspectors, Motive of Appointment of — Knowledge of Native Languages, etc.
Q. Mr. H. Samuel; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 18*, 174–175.
Treatment of Natives—Punishments.
Q. Mr. Whitley; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *June 7*, 923.
Wages.
Qs. Sir J. Gorst, Mr. Bryce, Sir H. Fowler, Dr. Macnamara; *As.* Mr. Lyttelton, *June 13*, 1484, 1485.

Magistracy—Names, Ages, Experience, etc., of Nominees, Receipt of Despatch from Lord Milner with Information for Return showing.
Q. Mr. J. Ellis; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 18*, 177.

Return presented, *May 31*, 423; *June 7*, 909.

Mines.
Commissioner of, Name, Salary, Previous Experience, etc.
Q. Mr. J. Ellis; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *June 6*, 790–791.

De Beers Mines—Rate of Mortality from accidents and other causes among white and native labourers—Return presented, *June 10*, 1368.

Labour in, *see sub-headings* Chinese Labour and Labour Question—Native.

Robinson Deep Mine, Accident at—Tabling Coroner's Jury's verdict—Workmen's compensation.
Q. Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 18*, 173

Rock Drilling—Making use of water jet compulsory.
Q. Dr. Hutchinson; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 17*, 38–39.

Transvaal—*cont.*
Mines—*cont.*
Tax on Gold Mine Profits, Method of Assessing—Presentation of Papers, proposed.
Q. Mr. Whitley; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *June 9*, 1220.
Stores and Supplies Purchased through Crown Agents — Johannesburg Chamber of Commerce, Resolutions of Protest by.
O. Earl of Portsmouth, *June 10*, 1334.
War Contribution, Arrangements as to payment of.
Q. Mr. Whitley; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *June 13*, 1491.
Zoutpansberg — Natives, Unrest among, alleged.
Q. Master of Elibank; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *June 13*, 1486, 1487.

Trawling
Illegal.
Kenmare River, French Boats in—Steps taken to protect local Fishermen.
Qs. Mr. Boland, Mr. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 9*, 1228, 1229.
Tackle Seized, Destruction of, instead of Sale, proposed—Scotch and Irish Methods.
Qs. Mr. MacVeagh, Mr. C. Wason; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *June 8*, 1072-1073.

Treasury
First Lord—Mr. A. J. Balfour.

Trevelyan, Mr. C. P. [Yorkshire, W.R., Elland]
Aliens Bill—Motion to commit to Standing Committee on Law, *June 8*, 1084.
Japanese Army, Cost of, per year, since 1899, *June 13*, 1478.
Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *June 6*, 817.
Penal Servitude Bill, 2R., *June 3*, 745.
Rhodesia, Importation of Chinese Labour to, proposed.
Consulting Wishes of Rhodesians on — Allowing opportunity for Discussion, *June 8*, 1078.
Differences between Transvaal Question and—Allowing Discussion, *June 6*, 793.
Straits Settlements—Chinese Indentured labour, Terms of employment of, *June 13*, 1487.
Transvaal and Rhodesia, Mortality in Mines of, Date of tabling Report on, *June 6*, 791.

Trinity College, Dublin
See under Dublin.

Trinity College, Oxford
Statute amending Statute VI., Presented, *June 8*, 1044; *June 9*, 1185.

Tritton, Mr. C. E. [Lambeth, Norwood]
Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *June 7*, 977.

Tuberculosis
Human and Bovine, Commission of Inquiry into—Interim Report Presented, *May 31*, 424; *June 7*, 909.
Sanatoria for, growth of—Danger of, and inability of Local Authorities to cope with.
Os. Sir E. Sassoon, *May 19*, 386; Mr. W. Long, 389.

Tuberculosis (Animals) Compensation Bill
Committee of Inquiry into, Nomination of, *June 8*, 1084.

"Turbo"
Chinese Seamen, Trial of, for desertion, Grounds of charge, etc.
Q. Mr. Joyce; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *June 9*, 1208.

Turkey
Macedonia, *see that title.*
Trade Report, Presented, *June 7*, 907, 908.

Tweedmouth, Lord
Tibet Expedition, Progress of—Policy of H.M. Government, etc., *May 17*, 18–20.

Tynemouth Gas Bill
c. Con. June 13*, 146.

Tyneside Tramways and Tramroads Bill
c. Rep.* *June 13*, 1463.

Typhoid Fever
Inoculation against, tabling Report of Committee of Inquiry.
Q. Mr. E. Wason; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *June 6*, 788–789.

Uganda
Administration of, Date of transferring, from Foreign to Colonial Office.
Qs. Mr. H. Samuel, Mr. C. Wason; *A.* Earl Percy, *June 7*, 926–927.

Uganda Railway Acts, 1896, 1902
Account and Report presented, *May 31*, 424.

"Undaunted," H.M.S.
Firing of Heavy Guns off Torbay, Nuisance caused by, taking Steps to minimise.
Q. Sir J. Kennaway; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *June 6*, 777.

Undersized Fish Bill
Date of Second Reading.
Q. Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 7*, 919.

Union of Benefices (Metropolis) Act, 1860
St. John and St. Saviour, Fitzroy Square—Scheme presented *May 17*, 4, 29.

United Irish League
Ballinasloe Meeting, Intimidation, etc., at—Steps proposed to be taken by the Government.
Os. Earl of Westmeath, *May 19*, 330–334; Earl of Denbigh, 336.
Boycotting and Intimidation by, Instances of.
Os. Lord Clonbrock, *June 13*, 1421, 1422; Lord Barrymore, 1425.
Land Act, Working of—Agitation and Intimidation by the League—Steps taken to prevent.
Os. Earl of Westmeath, *May 19*, 330–334; Lord Clonbrock, 334, 335; Earl of Denbigh, 336; Lord Clonbrock, *June 13*, 1419–1421, 1423; Lord Barrymore, 1425, 1426; Lord Ashbourne, 1427, 1428; Lord Oranmore and Browne, 1431; Earl of Arran, 1432; Marquess of Lansdowne, 1433, 1434.

United States
Coastwise Laws of, application of, to the Philippine Islands—Representations on the part of H.M. Government.
Os. Lord Muskerry, *June 13*, 1454–1456; Marquess of Lansdowne, 1458, 1459.
Cotton Trade, Corners in—Preventive Measures, obtaining and tabling Information as to.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *May 19*, 345.
Trade Report presented, *June 7*, 908, 910.

Universities
Dublin, *see* Dublin—Trinity College.
Oxford—Trinity College—Statute amending Statute VI. presented, *June 8*, 1044; *June 9*, 1185.

University of Leeds Bill
c. Con. May 18*, 157.
3R.* *May 31*, 421.
l. Commons' Amendments, *Con.* June 7*, 907.

Vaccination
Certificates, Additional Notices printed on, by Local Practitioners, Cost, etc.
O. Mr. Weir, *June 2*, 676, 679.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *May 19*, 361.
Qs. Mr. Weir, Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Mr. G. Lawson, *June 2*, 624.
Lymph, *see that title.*
Prosecutions—Lambeth—Employment of Solicitor by Vaccination Officer.
Q. Mr. Corrie Grant; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *June 9*, 1210.

Vagrancy

Children, Control of—Necessity for legislation.
Os. Sir John Gorst, *June 2*, 647, 648; Mr. Crooks, 648; Mr. C. Hay, 653.

Departmental Committee of Inquiry into Question—Date of appointing.
O. Mr. C. Hay, *June 2*, 655.

Difficulties of dealing with—Establishment of Labour Colonies, etc, proposed.
Os. Mr. J. Hutton, *June 2*, 655; Sir A. Hayter, 656, 657; Mr. T. Taylor, 659-661; Mr. Long, 668.

Inquiry into, Date of Appointing Royal Commission of.
Os. Mr. C. Hay, *June 2*, 655; Mr. Long, 668.

Legislation Amending Acts as a whole, Suggested Introduction of.
Q. Mr. S. Ormsby-Gore; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *May 18*, 179.

Valentia

Ferry, Provision of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 9*, 1227.

Verulam, Earl of

Barnet District Gas and Water Bill, 2R., *May 19*, 306.

Victoria and Albert Museum

Building—Number of men employed.
Q. Sir H. Fowler; *A.* Lord Balcarres, *June 9*, 1205.

"Vigilant"

Rum Ration to Sailors, Abolition of, proposed.
O. Mr. Weir, *May 31*, 473.

Vincent, Sir E. [Exeter]

Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *June 7*, 970.

Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. H. [Sheffield, Central]

Army.

Compulsory Service—Recommendations of Norfolk Commission of Inquiry, Government Attitude towards, *June 6*, 804-805.

Entrance Examinations for Woolwich and Sandhurst, Syllabuses of, *May 19*, 352.

Indian—Organisation and Training—Tabling Lord Kitchener's Memorandum, *May 19*, 350.

Penal Servitude Bill, 2R., *June 3*, 740.

Vivisection

See Animals—Experiments on.

Voluntary Schools

See under Education.

Volunteers

Norfolk Commission of Inquiry.

Compulsory Service, *see that title.*

Recommendations, Date of putting in force.
Q. Sir E. Flower; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *June 13*, 1478.

Report Presented, *May 31*, 424; *June 7*, 908.

Statement by War Secretary before taking Vote, Suggested.
Qs. Mr. McCrae, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 8*, 1080.

Rifle Ranges—Rugby—Allowing Town Volunteers same Privilege as School Corps—Providing Additional Range.
Q. Mr. Corrie Grant; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *May 19*, 353.

Training of—Cost, Additional Annual, to the State by providing Out-of-pocket Expenditure of Volunteers.
Q. Mr. Lambert; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *June 6*, 789-790.

Vote for, Date of Taking, Making Statement on Norfolk Commission previous to, etc.
Qs. Mr. S. Ormsby-Gore, Mr. McCrae, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 8*, 1079-1080.

Waggons

Loaded—Regulation as to Width of Tyre, Alteration of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Ffrench; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 13*, 1476.

Waldron, Mr. [Dublin, St. Stephen's Green]

Finance Bill, 2R., *May 18*, 204.

Taxation of Ireland—Protest against Overtaxation, *May 18*, 204-206.

Wales

Military Commands—Creating Separate Command for South Wales.
Q. Mr. D. A. Thomas; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *May 17*, 38.

Wallace, Mr. R. [Perth]

Education [Scotland] Bill, *Com.*, *June 13*, 1532.

Friendly Societies, Unregistered—Position of—Payment of Income-tax, etc., *May 31*, 477.

Walton, Mr. J. L. [Leeds, S.]

Russo-Japanese War—Contraband, Russian Declaration as to, *June 6*, 804.

Walton, Mr. Joseph [Yorkshire, W.R., Barnsley]

Anglo-French Convention Bill, 2R., *June 1*, 556-561.

Walton, Mr. Joseph—*cont.*
China.
Commercial Treaty with Great Britain—Scope of, Date of Coming into Force, etc., *May 19*, 392.
Newchwang, Evacuation of, by the Russians—Steps taken to safeguard lives and property of British Subjects, *May 19*, 390, 391.
Railway Concessions in—Steps taken to Advance British Interests, etc., *May 19*, 391.
Transvaal, Introduction of Chinese Labour to—Restriction to Unskilled Labour, *June 9*, 1218.

Warden Estate
Evicted Tenants, Applications from, for Re-instatement.
Qs. Mr. Boland; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 13*, 1493, 1494.

Warner, Mr. T. C. T. [Stafford, Lichfield]
Auxiliary Forces, Reduction of, etc., Deferring, until after Discussion of Whole Scheme of Army Reform, *June 1*, 498, 499.
Customs Boatmen—System of Appointment, *May 31*, 450.
Indian Councils Bill, 2R. *June 1*, 612.
Licensing Bill, *Com. June 6*, 861.
Militia—Dining Tent, Alleged Government Refusal to Supply, etc., *May 19*, 355.
Musical Copyright Bill, *Com. June 10*, 1411.

War Office
Secretary of State—Mr. H. O. Arnold-Forster.
Under-Secretary—Earl of Donoughmore.
Financial Secretary—Mr. W. Bromley-Davenport.
Clerks, Abstractor, Compulsory Retirement of, at Age of Sixty—Civil Service Clerks gazetted to War Office etc.
Q. Sir Thomas Esmonde; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *June 1*, 495-496.
Reconstitution Committee Report, Date of Discussion on.
Q. Mr. Chapman; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 8*, 1079.
Roberts, Lord—Pay, Reason for Continuing.
Qs. Mr. Markham, Mr. S. Ormsby-Gore; *As.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *June 9*, 1214.

Warwickshire
Polling Districts, Alterations in—Order presented, *June 1*, 493.

Wason, Mr. E. [Clackmannan and Kinross]
Enteric Fever, Inoculation against, Tabling Committee Report on, *June 6*, 788.
Post Office—Stamps, Books of Half-penny, Suggested Issue of, *June 6*, 797-798.
Shop Hours Bill, 2R. *June 1*, 608.

Wason, Mr. J. C. [Orkney and Shetland]
Africa, East.
Administration of British Protectorate and of Uganda, Transfer from Foreign to Colonial Office, *June 7*, 926.
Alienation of Territory in—Protests, *June 9*, 1222, 1294-1296.
Jewish Settlement in—Appointing Independent Commission of Inquiry, *May 17*, 39.
Congo Free State—Case of Silvanus Jones, *May 18*, 178.
Customs Department—Preventive Officers, Pay of, Improvement in, proposed, *May 31*, 456.
Education (Scotland) Bill, *Com. June 13*, 1534, 1540.
Motor Cars.
Parks, Regulations, Speed limit, etc., *June 9*, 1225.
Speed Regulations for—Granting power to Local Authorities to enforce, *June 2*, 635.
Motor-Cycles—Furious Driving in Trafalgar Square and Pall Mall—Prosecuting Offenders, *May 17*, 40.
Poor Law, Scotland—Medical Relief, Report of Departmental Committee on, *June 6*, 801.
Transvaal, Importation of Chinese Labour to—Restriction to Unskilled Labour, *June 9*, 1217.
Trawling, Illegal—Dealing with seized Tackle, *June 8*, 1072.

Waterford, Marquess of
Yeomanry, Inspection of—Musketry training, etc., *June 13*, 1448, 1449.

Water Orders Confirmation Bill
l. 2R.* *June 7*, 907.

Waziristan
Administration, Cost of, etc.
Q. Mr. Schwann; *A.* Mr. Broderick, *June 9*, 1221.

Weights and Measures Bill
c. Con., June 10, 1416.

Weights and Measures (Metric System) Bill
l. 3R., *May 17*, 11.
c. 1R.* *June 9*, 1234.

Weir, Mr. J. G. [Ross and Cromarty]
Animals, Experiments on, Educational value of—Report of Royal College of Physicians, *May 19*, 346.
Blaxall, Dr.—Use of Government lymph, etc., for private profit, *June 2*, 676, 679.

[*cont.*

eir, Mr. J. G.—*cont.*

- Cape Four per cent. Stock—Deductions from Dividends on account of Income-tax, *May 31*, 482, 487; *June 7*, 928.
- Deer Forests, Inaccuracy of Returns as to, *May 31*, 482.
- Dog Licences.
  - Amount received in fines in respect of people neglecting to take out, *May 31*, 481, 487.
  - Prosecutions for being without, Statistics of, for 1903 and 1904—Fines, *June 8*, 1073, 1074.
- Durness, Sutherland, Reason for Omission of, from Parochial Medical Officers Return, 1903, *June 8*, 1046–1047.
- Education — Ross-shire Schools, Arrangements as to Water Supply for, *June 7*, 919–920, 929.
- Education (Scotland) Bill, *Com.*, *June 13*, 1530.
- Highlands and Islands.
  - Deaths in—Large proportion of uncertified, *May 19*, 418.
  - Light Railway construction in, *June 2*, 710.
  - Western Highlands, Arranging for Training Vessel to visit, *June 7*, 922.
- India.
  - Dhar, Dewan of—Inquiry as to restoration of confiscated portion of Estate, proposed, *June 9*, 1211.
  - Official Secrets Bill—Points objected to by Members of Select Committee, *May 19*, 350.
  - Police Report, Date of tabling, *May 19*, 350.
- Indian Councils Bill, Additional expenditute under, in salaries, etc., *June 9*, 1210.
- Lewis Island of — Footpaths for Lochs district, *May 19*, 362.
- Lymph.
  - Central Vaccine Institution for Scotland, Supply to—Using glycerinated in place of humanised lymph, *June 8*, 1074–1075.
  - Humanised Calf, Success of, compared with that of glycerinated, *June 8*. 1074.
  - Standard of Quality and Strength, Fixing, *June 2*, 677, 679.
- Mallaig, Breakwater at—Date of completion, *June 2*, 710.
- Mecca, Pilgrims to, Protection for—*June 7*, 924.
- Milk.
  - Adulteration of, Steps taken to check, *June 2*, 675, 679.
  - Epidemics due to — Inspection of Dairies by Public Veterinary Surgeons, proposed, *June 13*, 1489.

Weir, Mr. J. G.—*cont.*

- Musical Copyright Bill, *Com.*, *June 10*, 1385, 1386, 1392, 1408–1410, 1412.
- Penal Servitude Bill, 2R., *June 3*, 767.
- Post Office Savings Bank — Postage — Reason for increased Estimate, *May 19*, 359–360.
- Railways.
  - Bye-laws, Uniform Code of, proposed, *June 2*, 711.
  - Electric—Steps taken to secure safety of Passengers, *June 2*, 712.
  - Overcrowding of Carriages, *June 2*, 711.
- Ross-shire.
  - Hospital Accommodation, Need of, *June 7*, 928.
  - Water Supply for Schools in, *June 7*, 919–920, 929.
- Smugglers, Capture of, Amount of Estimate for, etc., *May 31*, 471.
- Staffordshire, 3rd North, Regiment—Alleged wrongful Arrest of W. Vernon, *June 2*, 621; *June 9*, 1214.
- Transvaal, Importation of Chinese Labour to — Hong-Kong, Coolies awaiting Shipment at, *May 19*, 356.
- Vaccination.
  - Certificates, Additional Notices Printed on by Local Practitioners, etc., *May 19*, 361; *June 2*, 624, 676, 679.
  - Lymph, *see that subheading*
  - National Vaccine Establishment—Details of Expenditure, *June 2*, 677.
- "Vigilant"—Abolition of Rum Ration to Sailors, proposed, *May 31*, 473.

Wenlock, Lord

- Yeomanry Establishment, Changes in, Proposed reduction in Strength of Units, etc., *May 19*, 319.

Westmeath, Earl of

- Land Act, Working of—Agitation and Intimidation by the United Irish League, etc., *May 19*, 330–334, 337; *June 13*, 1429–1431.

Westminster Bridge

- Tramway Terminus, Removal of—Proposed Government Action.
  - *Q.* Capt. Jessel; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *May 31*, 427.

West Riding Tramways Bill

- c. 2R.* *May 31*, 421.

Wharton, Rt. Hon. J. L. [York, W.R., Ripon]

- Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *June 6*, 838; *June 7*, 947.

Whisky

Manufacture of, from Impure Commodities—Government Protection of Irish Growers of Cereals, proposed.

Q. Mr. Ffrench; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *June 13*, 1477.

Whitby Gas Bill

c. Lords' Amendts., *Con.* May 19*, 338.

White, Mr. G. [Norfolk, N.W.]

Licensing Bill, *Com., June 7*, 1008.

Whiteley, Mr. G. [Yorkshire, W.R., Pudsey]

Friendly Societies, Unregistered, Income Tax levied on, by Inland Revenue Authorities, *May 31*, 473-475, 476.

Whitley, Mr. J. H. [Halifax]

Aliens Bill.

Expenses, Resolutions as to, *June 8*, 1133, 1157.

Motion to Commit to Standing Committee on Law, *June 8*, 1120.

Business of the House, Course of, *June 9*, 1234; *June 13*, 1505.

Customs Department.

Port and Star Allowances, Information as to, *May 31*, 466, 469, 470.

Smugglers, Capture of, Amount of Estimate for, etc., *May 31*, 467, 470.

Staff.

Dismissal of Staff Engaged to Levy the Corn Tax, etc., proposed, *May 31*, 437, 438.

Increase in, Reasons for, *May 31*, 438, 445.

Division Challenged Frivolously—Members Requested to rise in their places — Position of Members already in the Lobbies, *June 2*, 707.

Definition of Members requested to rise in their places, *June 3*, 721.

Indian Councils Bill, 2R., *June 1*, 611.

Macedonia, Repatriation of Refugees from, *June 7*, 925.

Orange River Colony Finance—Information as to present condition, *June 9*, 1220.

Parliamentary Procedure — New Rules, Date of resuming consideration of, *May 17*, 37, 38.

Penal Servitude Bill, 2R., *June 3*, 747.

Shop Hours Bill, 2R., *June 1*, 583.

Site for Duke of York's School Bill, 2R., *June 13*, 1592.

Transvaal

Chinese Labour, Importation of.

Arrival of Advance Party at Durban, alleged, *June 13*, 1486.

Hours of Work per Month, *May 18*, 176.

Whitley, Mr. J. H.—*cont.*

Transvaal—*cont.*

Chinese Labour—*cont.*

Offices, Depôts, etc., Estimated Cost of Building, *May 31*, 434.

Wages Regulations, *May 17*, 37.

Finance—Information as to Present Position, *June 9*, 1220.

Mines—Tax on Gold Mine Profits, method of Assessing, *June 9*, 1220.

Native Labour in Mines.

Forced Labour for Offenders, Alleged, *May 18*, 177, 178; *June 13*, 1486.

Punishment of Natives, *June 7*, 923.

War Contribution, Arrangements as to Payment of, *June 13*, 1491.

Whitstable

Charities, Draft Scheme for—Proposed Diverting of Teacher's Salaries for Building National School—Withholding Sanction from Scheme.

Q. Mr. Slack; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *June 2*, 619.

Whitsuntide Recess

Adjournment of the House.

Motion [Sir A. Acland-Hood] *May 19*, 369.

Whittaker, Mr. T. P. [Yorkshire, W.R., Spen Valley]

Licensing Bill, *Com., June 6*, 809, 828, 835, 849, 851; *June 7*, 944; *June 8*, 1178.

Wolverhampton Corporation Bill

l. Report from Select Committee, *June 10*, 1325.

Williams, Mr. A. O. [Merionethshire]

Poor Law Unions — Re-adjustment of Areas and Uniformity of Valuation, *June 13*, 1473.

Taxation, Local—Commission of Inquiry—Representation of Boards of Guardians, *June 13*, 1473.

Williams, Col. R. [Dorset, W.]

Licensing Bill, *Com., June 6*, 829, 848.

Wilson, Mr. H. J. [Yorkshire, W.R., Holmfirth]

Post Office—Pillar Boxes in W.C. District, Inaccuracy of Time Plates on, *May 19*, 349.

Winchester, Marquess of

Yeomanry.

Equipment, Training, and Organisation of, *June 13*, 1441-1443.

Number of Regiments assembled for Training between 18th May and 4th June—Number of Officers and Men in receipt of £5 Horse Allowance, *June 10*, 1264.

Woodhouse, Sir J. T. [Huddersfield]
Post Office—Wages—Bradford Committee, Date of Tabling Report of, *June 2*, 623.

Woollen Manufacture
Canada, Import Duty of, Proposed Rise in—Comparison with Duties imposed in 1896 and subsequent years.
Q. Mr. D. A. Thomas; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *June 6*, 798.

Woolwich
Military College Entrance Examination, Syllabus of.
Q. Sir H. Vincent; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *May 19*, 352-353.

Workhouses
Children in, Objections to Retention of—Carrying out Recommendations of Departmental Committee of 1895.
Os. Sir J. Gorst, *June 2*, 642; Mr. Crooks, 651; Mr. Long, 663.
Imbeciles and Weak-minded Persons in, Treatment of.
O. Mr. J. Hutton, *June 2*, 656.
Nursing in—Local Government Board Order — Ascertaining Opinions of Boards of Guardians and furnishing Draft to Poor Law Unions Associations, Proposed.
Q. Sir H. Samuel; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *June 13*, 1472.
Paupers in Charge of Lodge of Admission, Objections to.
O. Mr. T. Taylor, *June 2*, 660.
Rural Districts, Condition in—Appointment of Committee of Inspection, Proposed.
Os. Mr. J. Hutton, *June 2*, 656; Mr. Long, *June 2*, 669.
Scotland, in—Report of Departmental Committee on Poor Law Medical Relief, Steps to carry out Recommendations in.
Q. Mr. M. Ferguson; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *June 6*, 783.
Qs. Mr. Tennant, Mr. C. Wason; *A.* Mr. S. Dickson, *June 6*, 800-801.
Q. Mr. Haldane; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *June 7*, 920.

Working Classes
Housing of, *see* Housing.

Workmen's Compensation (Amendment) Bill
Date of Introduction.
Os. Mr. Shackleton, *May 19*, 408, 409; Mr. A. Douglas, 417.
Q. Mr. J. F. Hope; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *May 31*, 427.

Works
First Commissioner—Lord Windsor.

Worsley-Taylor, Mr. H. W. [Lancashire, Blackpool]
Licensing Bill, *Com.*, *June 6*, 890.

Wyndham, Rt. Hon. G.—*Chief Secretary for Ireland* [Dover]
Adams Estate, near Cork—Dealing with Single Application for Re-instatement on Landlord's terms, *May 19*, 344.
Agricultural and Technical Instruction Department.
Clare Committee—Reason for non-Appointment of Miss Freeman as Instructress in Butter-making, etc., *May 19*, 351-352.
Loans from, in Aid of Irish Industries—Nature of Security, *June 3*, 719-720.
Loch Leven Trout, arranging to lay down, in the Upper Bann River, *June 3*, 719.
Veterinary Branch — Memorial of Officers, Cause of delay in answering, etc., *May 18*, 183; *June 3*, 718.
Aughris, Sligo, Pier and Boatslip at, Completion of, *May 18*, 182.
Ballinasloe Lunatic Asylum—Appointment of Dr. Kirwan—Sanction of Lord-Lieutenant, *May 19*, 366-368.
Ballyrankin Estate, Wexford—Sale of Interest of Three Tenants to adjoining Tenant, *May 31*, 430.
Bee-keeping—Foul Brood, Destruction of Bees suffering from—Legislation proposed, *June 13*, 1477.
Belfast, Valuation Appeals, Delay in hearing, proposed, *June 13*, 1496, 1497.
Buncrana Pier, Inadequacy of, *May 19*, 344.
Congested Districts Board.
Fitzgerald Estate, Mayo, Securing Grazing Lands on, for Congested Areas, *May 18*, 170; *June 7*, 921-922.
Kerry, North—Number of Congested Electoral Divisions—Expenditure on Fisheries, 1897 to 1903, etc., *May 17*, 44.
Loans from, in Aid of Irish Industries—Nature of Security, *June 3*, 719-720.
Constabulary.
Anderson Constable, Dismissal of, *June 13*, 1497-1500.
Cork, in 1892 and 1893—Statutory Strength and Strength Maintained, *May 19*, 345.
Cycle Stealing Case in Dublin—Number purchased by Constabulary, etc., *June 13*, 1496.
Dungannon Disturbances, Action in. *May 18*, 182-183.
Hodge and Richardson, Cadets—Absence on Leave—Pay and Allowances, *May 17*, 46.
Photography—Snap-shots, New Instructions as to taking, etc., *June 6*, 785.
Reduction in Men and Officers, 1884 to 1904, *May 17*, 46.

[*cont.*

Wyndham, Rt. Hon. G.—*cont.*
- Cooscroum Landing Stage, Inadequacy of Improvement made to, *May 19*, 364-365.
- Derrygonnelly, Insanitary Condition of, *May 17*, 42.
- Donegal Landlords agreeing to sell under Land Act 1903, Names of, etc., *June 6*, 783-784.
- Down, Number of Landlords and Tenants in—Names of Landlords agreeing to sell, etc., *June 6*, 801.
- Drogheda Mortuary, Body left for two months in, *June 8*, 1054.
- Dublin Cycle Thefts—Legal Representation of the Crown in Trial—Number purchased by Constabulary, etc., *May 19*, 364; *June 13*, 1496.
- Dungannon Disturbances—Action of Constabulary, *May 18*, 182-183.
- Education.
  - Attendance, New Rules as to, *June 13*, 1496.
  - Building Plans, Decision as to, *June 9*, 1227.
  - New Code — Examination Papers, Settlement of, by Committee of Three, *June 8*, 1053-1054.
- Erne, Lough—Drainage charges, Inclusion of, in inquiry as to Trinity College rents, proposed, *June 13*, 1493.
- Evictions.
  - Killorglin, Securing Re-instatement of F. Butler at, *May 19*, 365.
  - Longford Estate, Application of A. Caddell for Re-instatement, *June 6*, 801.
  - Statistics as to Applications for and Re-instatements made, *June 6*, 786.
  - Trenan Estate, on—Enabling Tenants to purchase Holdings, etc., *June 10*, 1371.
  - Warden Estate—Applications received from evicted Tenants, *June 13*, 1494.
- Fair Rents—Second-term—Case of Mr. H. Halpin of Whitestown, *May 18*, 171.
- Fisheries.
  - Ardglass Herring Fishery Inquiry, Result of, *June 2*, 626.
  - Cooscroum Landing Stage, Inadequacy of Improvement made to, *May 19*, 364-365.
  - Kerry, North.
    - Beale and Gullane, Applications from, for improved Facilities, *May 19*, 366.
    - Expenditure of Congested Districts Boards on, 1897-1903, etc., *May 17*, 44.
  - Loch Leven Trout, Laying Down, in Upper Bann River, *June 3*, 719.
  - Rod and Line Fishing, Granting Return, showing Opening and Closing Dates for, *May 17*, 45.

Wyndham, Rt. Hon. G.—*cont.*
- Fitzgerald Estate, Mayo, Securing Grazing Lands on, for Congested Areas, *May 18*, 170; *June 7*, 921-922.
- Fitzwilliam, Earl, Ejectment Notices served to Tenants of — Accepting Landlord's Terms of Sale, etc., *June 2*, 625; *June 6*, 803.
- Fiscal Policy—Taxation of Food, Government Attitude towards, *May 18*, 262.
- Galway Docks, Dredger for, *June 2*, 628.
- Hurley Estate, Sale of—Arrangements as to turbary rights, *June 13*, 1493.
- Irish Society, Londonderry Estates of, Sale of—Taking Precautions to carry out Objects of the Trust, etc., *June 7*, 930-931.
- Kenware River, Illegal Trawling in, by French Boats, *June 9*, 1229.
- Kerry.
  - Congested Electoral Divisions in North—Expenditure on Fisheries, 1897 to 1903, etc., *May 17*, 44.
  - Fisheries of, *see under subheading* Fisheries.
  - Landlords agreeing to sell Estates in—Number and Names of, Valuation, Rentals, etc. of Estates, *May 17*, 32.
- Kilbride Camp Canteen Licence, Order for, Signed by Two Magistrates in Opposition to their Colleagues, Validity of, etc., *June 2*, 626; *June 6*, 802.
- Killorglin, Evicted Tenant at, Securing Re-instatement of, *May 19*, 365.
- Kingston Estate—Dispute as to Terms of Sale, *May 19*, 363-364.
- Labourers' Cottages — Loans, Terms of Granting, *June 9*, 1212.
- Land Act of 1903.
  - Head Rents and Tithe Rent-charge, Relative Values of, *May 19*, 403.
  - Working of—Obstruction by Trinity College and the Landlords, alleged, *May 19*, 402-404.
- Land Purchase.
  - Adams Estate near Cork—Dealing with single Application for Re-instatement on Landlord's Terms, *May 19*, 344.
  - Ballyrankin Estate, Wexford—Sale of Interest of three Tenants to adjoining Tenant — Sanction of Commissioners, *May 31*, 430.
  - Donegal, Landlords Agreeing to Sell in, Names of—Valuation, Rents, etc., of Estates, *June 6*, 783-784.
  - Down, Number of Landlords and Tenants in—Names of Landlords Agreeing to Sell, etc., *June 6*, 801.
  - Education Commissioners' Estates—Granting Return showing Rentals, Receipts, Expenses, etc., *May 17*, 43.

[*cont.*

Wyndham, Rt. Hon. G.—*cont.*

Land Purchase—*cont.*

Fitzgerald Estate, Mayo, Sale of Grazing Lands by Private Treaty—Securing Grazing Lands for Congested Areas, *May 18*, 170; *June 7*, 921–922.

Fitzwilliam, Earl, Ejectment Notices served to Tenants of—Accepting Landlord's Terms of Sale, etc., *June 2*, 625; *June* 6, 803.

Hurley Estate, Sale of—Arrangements as to Turbary Rights, *June 13*, 1493.

Kerry, Number and Names of Landlords agreeing to sell in—Valuation, Rentals, etc., of Estates, *May 17*, 32.

Kingston Estate—Dispute as to Terms of Sale—*May 19*, 363–364.

Lloyd-Apjohn Estate—Progress of Sale, *May 17*, 43.

Longford Estate, Sale of—Application of A. Caddell for Re-instatement, *June 6*, 801.

Longworth Estate, Purchase of, by Congested Districts Board, *May 17*, 32.

Listowel and Tarbet Coach Service—Contract Price—Inviting Local Tenders, etc., *May 17*, 45; *May 19*, 366.

Lloyd-Apjohn Estate, Limerick—Progress of Sale, *May 17*, 43.

Local Government Board.

Grant—Amount and Application of Unexpended Balance, etc., *May 17*, 43–44.

Political Meetings, Allowing Paid Officials of District or County Councils to take part in, *June 10*, 1371.

Longford Estate, Westmeath, Arrangements for Sale of—Application of A. Caddell for Re-instatement, *June 6*, 801.

Longworth Estate, Purchase of, by Congested Districts Board, *May 17*, 32.

Lough Erne Drainage Charges, Inclusion of, in Inquiry as to Trinity College Rents, proposed, *June 13*, 1493.

Motor Car Services, Establishment of, Granting Local Authorities Power to levy Rate for, *June 2*, 626–627.

National School Teachers.

Average, Reducing, from Sixty to Fifty. Assistants, Several, to one School, Making Reduction in case of, *June 3*, 718.

Date of coming into Effect, *May 19*, 365.

Cornahilta—Promotion Regulations, *June 13*, 1492.

Fees Due to, for Evening Classes in Donegal, *June 8*, 1054.

Wyndham, Rt. Hon. G.—*cont.*

National School Teachers—*cont.*

Salaries, Regulations as to Increments of, *May 17*, 36; *June 6*, 785.

School Attendance Committees, Appointment as Secretaries of, Approval of the Board to, etc., *June 3*, 719.

Standard Numbers for different Grades, Responsibility for Fixing—Inter-Grade Teachers, *June 6*, 784.

Petty Sessions and Right of Appeal against Sentences, *June 13*, 1478, 1495.

Piers and Harbours.

Aughris, Sligo—Completion of Pier and Boatslip, *May 18*, 182.

Buncrana Pier, Inadequacy of, *May 19*, 344.

Poor Law—Outdoor Relief Regulations, *June 9*, 1228.

Public Trustee, Opening of Office of—Appointing Assistants, *May 19*, 351.

Quit and Crown Rents, Redemption of—Terms under Ashbourne and Land Acts of 1896 and 1903, *May 18*, 183.

Roscommon County Councillor, Imprisonment of, for Cruelty to Animals, *June 13*, 1495.

Teenan Estate, Evictions on—Enabling Tenants to purchase Holdings, *June 10*, 1371.

Tithe Rents, Redemption of—Terms under Ashbourne and Land Acts of 1896 and 1903, *May 18*, 183.

Tralee and Dingle Railway, Negotiations as to—Submitting Terms of Agreement to the House, *June 7*, 929–930.

Trawling, Illegal, in Kenmare river, by French boats, *June 9*, 1229.

Valentia—Provision of Ferry, proposed, *June 9*, 1227.

Waggons, Loaded—Regulations as to width of tyre, alteration of, proposed, *June 13*, 1476.

Warden Estate—Applications received from evicted tenants, *June 13*, 1494.

Whisky, Manufacture of, from impure materials, *June 13*, 1477.

Yeomanry, Imperial

Arming of Deficiencies in—Provision of Steel Weapon etc.

Os. Lord Lovat, *June 13*, 1436; Earl Roberts, 1440, 1441; Lord Harris, 1444; Earl of Erroll, 1448; Earl of Donoughmore, 1450.

Brigades.

Class of Officer to Command, in time of War.

O. Lord Lovat, *June 13*, 1437–1439.

Staff Officers for, Source of Supply.

Os. Lord Lovat, *June 13*, 1437; Earl of Donoughmore, 1453.

Yeomanry, Imperial—*cont.*
Clothing Grant, Inadequacy of.
O. Harris, *May 19*, 314, 315.

Constitution of, as a Fighting Force, Defects in.
Os. Lord Lovat, *June* 13, 1435, 1436; Lord Harris, 1443.

Development and efficiency of the Force.
Os. Lord Grenfell, *May 19*, 316, 317; Earl of Erroll, 317, 318.

Division of, into Cavalry and Mounted Infantry, proposed.
Os. Lord Lovat, *May 19*, 313; Earl of Donoughmore, 324.

Establishment, Changes in, Proposed Reduction in Strength of Units, etc.
Os. Lord Lovat, *May 19*, 310–314; Lord Harris, 314–316; Earl of Erroll, 317–319; Lord Wenlock, 319, Earl of Donoughmore, 320–324; Vis. Galway, 325; Lord Monteswell, 325–326; Lord Denman, 326–327; Marquess of Lansdowne, 328–330.

Horses, Number of.
Os. Lord Lovat, *May 19*, 312; Earl Carrington, 328.

Inspection of—Arrangements as to, Choice of officers, etc.
Os. Marquess of Winchester, *June 13*, 1442; Earl of Errol, 1446, 1447; Marquess of Waterford, 1449; Earl of Donoughmore 1451.

Musketry, *see under subheading* Training.

Officers, Senior, Separate courses of instruction for, proposed.
Os. Lord Lovat, 1436; Earl of Erroll, 1448; Viscount Galway, 1449.

Re-attestment, Alteration in period of, proposed.
Os. Marquess of Winchester, *June 13*, 1442; Earl of Donoughmore, 1451.

Re-engagement, Alteration in period for, proposed.
Q. Sir J. Dickson-Poynder; *A.* Mr. W. B. Davenport, *June 13*, 1481, 1482.

Signalling, *see under subheading* Training.

Special Service Squadron—Opposition to scheme.
Os. Earl of Donoughmore, *May 19*, 322; Lord Lovat, 322; Viscount Galway, 324; Lord Denman, 326–327; Marquess of Lansdowne, 329, 330.

Training of.

Horse allowance of £5, Number of Officers and Men receiving—Return as to.
Q. Marquess of Winchester; *A.* Earl of Donoughmore, *June 10*, 1264.

Yeomanry, Imperial—*cont.*
Training of—*cont.*
Musketry, in—Defects of Present System.
Os. Lord Lovat, *June 13*, 1436, 1439; Earl Roberts, 1440; Marquess of Winchester, 1441; Lord Harris, 1445; Marquess of Waterford, 1448; Viscount Galway, 1449; Earl of Donoughmore, 1451, 1452.

Regiments Assembled between 18 May and 4 June, Return as to number of.
Q. Marquess of Winchester; *A.* Earl of Donoughmore, *June 10*, 1264.

Signalling, in—Inadequate arrangements as to.
Os. Lord Lovat, *June 13*, 1438, 1439; Marquess of Winchester, 1442; Lord Harris, 1445; Earl of Erroll, 1447; Earl of Donoughmore, 1453.

Transport, Inadequate arrangements as to.
Os. Lord Lovat, *June 13*, 1438, 1439; Lord Harris, 1443, 1444; Earl of Donoughmore, 1453, 1454.

Yorkshire
West Riding, Polling Districts—Alteration in Hallamshire Parliamentary Division.
Order presented, *June 6*, 776; *June 7*, 912.

Yorktown and Blackwater Gas Bill
c. *Con.* May 18*, 157.
3R.* *May 31*, 421.
l. Commons' Amendts., *Con.* June 7*, 907.

Yoxall, Mr. J. H. [Nottingham, W.]
Civil Service Clerks—Abstractor Class—Promotions to Second Division, *June 6*, 778.

Cyprus, Vacant Archbishopric of, Steps taken as to—Result of Intervention of High Commissioner, *June 1*, 497–478.

Zanzibar
Administration of, Transferring, from Foreign to Colonial Office.
Q. Mr. Bayley; *A.* Earl Percy, *June 7*, 927.

Commercial rights and privileges in—Settlement under Anglo-French Convention.
O. Earl Percy, *June 1*, 501, 502.

Zoutpansberg
Natives, Unrest among, alleged.
Q. Master of Elibank; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *June 13*, 1486, 1487.

Zurich Cotton Congress
Corners in Cotton, International Co-operation to prevent, suggested—Governmental action as to.
Qs. Mr. Field, Mr. Markham; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 7*, 932–933.